A STUDY OF COMMUNITY ATTITUDES TOWARD MUSIC EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF SELECTED COMMUNITIES IN MISSOURI

by

Clifton A. Burmeister
B.A., Carleton College, 1933
M.Mus., Northwestern University, 1941

Submitted to the Department of Music Education and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Advisory Committee:

June, 1953

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. E. Thayer Gaston, Dr. James F. Nickerson, and Dr. Kenneth E. Anderson for their patience and generosity, and for the meticulous care which they devoted to the guidance of this study.

The field study itself would have been impossible without the splendid cooperation of superintendents, music directors, and interested citizens in the communities participating in the survey.

Sincere appreciation is due Miss Jane Wright for her help in preparing the first draft, and to Mrs. Jo Ann Cobb for typing the final copies.

Above all, the writer is humbly grateful to his wife for her assistance and sympathetic understanding during the many months required to complete the project of which this is the final report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Paralleling the written history of the development of music as an art there is a story yet to be told of the importance of music in the lives of the people. Part of that story can be found in the works of scholars who have delved into the primitive beginnings of music in search of clues which might illuminate steps in the development of the formal art. It has been emphasized that from the most primitive culture down to the present day, man has expressed himself emotionally in song and the rhythm of the dance. It is indicated that some form of musical expression is one of the most persistent aspects of man's experiences in communal living. Without benefit of written record or expert tutelage, in spite of disapproval and actual prohibition at times, the songs of the people have soothed the sick, the weary, and the young, have incited the courageous to battle and the hunt, have celebrated the victory and mourned the defeat. The desires of lovers as well as the strivings of all men for identification with the Infinite have found utterance in the most universal of all languages, Music.

In primitive society education of the children was a family-tribal function. The child learned the skills and

arts of life through practice in functional situations. Everything he learned was related directly to his life in society. The materials of the primitive curriculum were established by use and need, not by the opinion of profession experts. This was no less true of the songs men sang than of the weapons they fashioned. There was only one kind of music, and its worth was determined by its ability to function in the situation for which it was created. Thus, in primitive society the community directed the music education of its young.

What was true of primitive cultures is true in part today. Music is a vital force in present day life, but there is an obvious distinction made between formal and informal music, between art music and folk music, between art music and utilitarian music. Also, education in a complex society has been delegated to the professional teacher. He represents in practice a philosophy of education which has been developed over a period of centuries. It is, to be sure, a philosophy which was designed primarily to satisfy human needs, but the ultimate authority today as to what constitutes educational value rests in the hands of the community appointed expert.

The music educator occupies a somewhat precarious position in his role of arbiter on matters musical for both school and community. He represents an art which defines its values partially in terms of absolutes. He practices

in a community which generally respects the authority of his art but often seeks its enjoyment in more utilitarian forms of musical activity. He finds that he is expected to bring the best in music within the comprehension of his pupils, yet at the same time he is to use music as a tool in the general development of the child. The result has been the promotion of a double standard of musical values in education sanctioned by the authority of the professional expert.

The dichotomy between "good" and "bad" music is not peculiar to modern life. Its roots go far back in antiquity. Sachs found that in earliest civilizations while artisans, peasants and workmen retained their folk songs, the upper classes promoted the formation of groups of professionals, while still higher in the practice of the art were the musicians attached to the temples.[1] In the Sumerian epoch (4000 B.C. to 2300 B.C.) music was a fully established art. As such it was used in connection with religious services and was thought to possess magic powers. There was little difference in its use in other Near East civilizations - Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and Hebrew. In Egypt, musical practices were jealously guarded by the priests. The evidence of the existence of large ensembles such as the court orchestras of Egypt, Babylon, and Elam, suggest a high standard of musical education, skill, and knowledge. In these early civilizations, then, it can be concluded that while a distinction was made

---

[1]Sachs. The Rise of Music in the Ancient World.

between sacred and secular music it was primarily utilitarian and directly related to the life of the people. "Thus, music existed in the life of the Egyptians, as in that of other early civilizations, as an accessory, but not as an independent art."[2]

In Greece, the term for "music" was applied to a combination of poetry, music, and dancing. Plato stressed the use of music an gymnastics to cultivate the body and emotions as the foundation upon which to build later a sound intellectual life. "Although such an association limited its own development as an art, it made music of tremendous significance in the life of the people."[3] In the later periods of the Greek civilization music became more secular, sensual, and individual. "Music became a popular, sensual means for pleasure, indulged in for its own sake and cultivated more as a social fad than as an inherent necessity of life."[4]

The attitude of the early Church was to influence the history of music for the next 1000 years, and to shape its gradual development for a longer period. Whereas the Greeks considered music to be both a moral-political force and also a means for giving pleasure, the Church adopted the view that art was justifiable only in the sense that it could be made to serve God. Therefore, the practice of music must

---

[2]McKinney and Anderson. Music in History, p. 47.

[3]Ibid., p. 68.

[4]Ibid., p. 85.

be controlled by the Church, and even pleasure in its use for the glory of God was not to be condoned. Thus, the breach was opened further between the music of the people and the art music of the Church.

Yet people continued to sing, play, and dance. And while the Church frowned on secular singing and dancing with its strong rhythmical character, one concession to popular demands was made in permitting hymns to be sung by the entire congregation. The persistent vitality of folk music was later evidenced in the appearance of secular melodies and texts in the sacred motets of the 13th century. This popular practice became so prevalent that the Church was again forced to take drastic steps to separate its music from the vulgar influences of secular song.

Probably the first professional musicians other than those sponsored by the Church were the troubadors (composers) and jongleurs (performers) of the Middle Ages. Similarly, in Germany appeared the meistersingers, organized into guilds and practicing their art according to rigid rules and distinctions. This trend was to reach its culmination in the 15th century with the emergency of the artist-composer.

All of the arts were stimulated by the unleashing of creative activity during the period of the Rennaisance. The growth of music as an art during this time was marked by further separation of the artist as an individual set

apart. "The great fault of the Rennaisance conception of art was the sharp distinction it drew between art and life, beauty and truth."[5] Yet in spite of this trend as it concerns the individual artist it must be said that at no other time in history has music played a larger part in the life of the people as a whole.

> It is difficult for us today to realize how general was the practice of music in Rennaisance times. ---The unifying social cement which held together all cultural life was music, the one thing which all people could enjoy together. --- - all the people knew, and practiced music; the leisure time of all classes was taken up with music and dancing in those pre-novel, pre-radio days.[6]

Later, music became divorced further from the ordinary activities of life, and the cultivation of music drifted into the hands of specialists and professionals. Yet, art music still retained a tenuous hold upon some segments of societal life in that almost all composed music was created for a specific use, particularly in the court and the church. "One may say that until late in the 18th century there was scarcely any music conceivable that was not utilitarian. There was no 'art for art's sake'."[7]

The Baroque era strained this relationship with its incongrous warring of elements - life situations depicted through the media of unrealistic form and content. Coincident as this era was with the age of reason, the worship of

---

[5]McKinney and Anderson, op. cit., p. 228.

[6]Ibid., p. 290.

[7]Einstein, Music in the Romantic Era, p. 11.

form per se became paramount. So that during the Romantic era which followed it can be said that: "Art, and especially music, dissociated itself more and more from life."[8]

The split which began when music was first submitted to the authority of reason, probably in primitive society, certainly in earliest civilizations, was now complete. The practice of music became an esoteric art reserved for the highly talented and skilled professional. Virtuosity was raised to unprecedented heights. Beauty was defined in non-utilitarian, non-functional terms. Goodness became an exclusive term confined to that music which was beautiful by definition.

---

[8]Einstein, op. cit., p. 43.

Historical View of the Relationship of Public School Music to the Community

Music education in the United States from its beginnings has demonstrated the influence of the authority of the tradition of centuries. Before the establishment of public schools in this country the singing school was the chief agency of music instruction in the community. Originally desiged to improve congregational singing, the singing school developed into a medium for teaching skills and rudiments of music to young and old alike. Whole families took part and utilized their abilities in presenting oratorios and concerts of sacred music. However, in a utilitarian sense, the singing school satisfied community musical needs.

Music was the first of the expressive subjects to be included in the public school curriculum (1838), which is evidence that its practical utility in community life had been demonstrated. It is significant to note that music gained entry to the public school curriculum on the basis of practical rather than aesthetic values. For when school music teaching became a distinct profession absorbed in its relation to the field of general education the practical utility of music was relegated to a minor role. There was conflict in aims as to whether it was better to teach pupils to sing as many songs as possible by rote, or to teach pupils to read music so they could sing songs, but the values claimed were musical ones.

With the creation of the music supervisor and the placing of music teaching in the hands of the grade teacher the primary aim was to teach pupils to read music. And so it remained until the "child study" movement, around the turn of the century, revived the conflict in aims without questioning the primacy of aesthetic values. Samuel W. Cole speaking at the Boston meeting of the National Education Association in 1903 said:

> The real purpose of teaching music in the public schools is not to make expert sight singers nor individual soloists. A much nobler, grander, more inspiring privilege is yours and mine; to get the great mass to singing and to make them love it.[9]

Music education today continues to maintain that music in the schools should be taught so that every child shall have an opportunity to enjoy and appreciate music. But, without negating musical values, music educators now strive to emphasize music as a means to child development not only musically, but emotionally and socially as well.

In this brief statement of the development of the aims of public school music it is evident that when music entered the school curriculum it became divorced somewhat from the community which fostered it. The aims of music education have been determined by educators who have been concerned first with musical values, second, with the development of the child through the medium of music, and only incidentally with the larger relationship of school music and the community.

---

[9]Birge. History of Public School Music in the United States, p. 161.

Music in the schools has experienced a tremendous growth, particularly in the last thirty years, with full support and approval of the community, but it has been largely a process of adaptation on the part of the community to a program which long ago lost in part its identity with the musical life of the people.

The significant danger in this to general education is pointed out by Ulich.[10] Our civilization is delivering education into the hands of the "State." Even in democratic States there is an increasing trend toward centralization. This imposes a great responsibility upon education.

> The more the state will have to expand its influence upon all the various ways of life and our social institutions, the more will be needed a type of education which, in spite of all the comprises of political life, never loses sight of the persistent aspects of humanity.[11]

The solution, according to Ulich, emphasizes the role music should play in modern education.

> We must use constructively the different human talents, but do this in such a way that the democratic unity of the nation is not imperiled. To succeed in this enterprise we must use as a common basis of education useful practical work, sport, and all those activities which appeal to the emotions. For in their emotions men are united, whereas the inevitable differences of intellect separate men from one another.[12]

---

[10]Ulich. History of Educational Thought.

[11]Ibid., p. 343

[12]Ibid., p. 347.

The Relationship of Public School Music to the Community Today

A number of music educators are aware of the dangers inherent in a program of shcool music which is so little influenced by community needs and desires, and which in turn has such negligible influence on community musical life. Twenty years ago Augustus Zanzig stated:

> One leader in public school music has gone so far as to say that if in the next ten years the musical accomplishments of the schools have no greater effect on life outside the schools than they now have, municipalities will refurse to continue the present provision for them.[13]

That this prophecy was not fulfilled is evidenced by the continued growth and public support of school music. This does not indicate a more effective liason between school music and the community, for Pitts said more recently:

> Whether or not a machine age is capable of giving music back to the people in the sense of developing a musical productivity that originates in the human medium, may turn out to be the most crucial question that music education has yet been called upon to answer.[14]

She pointed out that the consumer public is no longer dependent upon the music teacher for the satisfaction of musical needs. There are commercial producers ready to give this public what it thinks it wants. One result has been the expression of a

---

13 Zanzig. "The Place of the Public School in the Music of the Community" Music Teachers National Association Proceedings, 1930, p. 77.

14 Pitts. The Music Curriculum in a Changing World, p. 11.

desire on the part of the mass audience that music not be defined away from its homely services to everyday life. The public is in a position not only to make choices but comparisons.

Eilert called attention to the fact that while bands, orchestras, and choruses were increasing in school, they were disappearing in community life.[15] He believed that it indicated a decline in the will to make and hear music. He charged school music with not having cultivated this urge in sufficient strength to survive graduation and supported his charge with a statement by Kwalwasser:

> How futile are many of our teaching efforts in music concerning themselves primarily with perverted objectives of reading and technique, and failing to develop the will to make and hear music, which is the only legitimate reason for the reading and technical objectives.[16]

The same criticism is implicit in a statement by Glenn:

> The school administrator begins by thinking in terms of the community itself. The central thought of his staff, to which the director of music belongs must be to weld the whole community into an effective unit rather than to make the schools a unit in the community. Knowing that a school system cannot function in a social vacuum, the administration makes plans beyond the school room. Social activities of today are as wide as the social contacts of the pupils in the school, and the superintendent has a right to expect his music department to function toward these social aims in education.

---

[15]Eilert. "Music Education and the Community" Music Educators Journal, 27:17.

[16]Kwalwasser. Problems in Public School Music, p. 91.

> This plan must not only be concerned with organization in curriculum activities but must reach all of the social contacts of the child, for music activities in the classroom which do not carry over into homes, churches, clubs, concert halls, places of recreation, and amusements are not activities of such a nature as to be a vital force in life.[17]

A well established music program can be evaluated partially in terms of what is going on in the community that owes its support to the influence that public school music has had upon the citizens. For, as Hetherington said:

> If one finds extensive adult music activities in a community, there is good reason to believe that the music education in the schools a generation ago was not neglected. --- A good music program in the schools is generally a prelude to these adult organizations.[18]

Wiebe pictured the community as a force working in opposition to the music educator who strives to realize a modern philosophy of music education in his community.[19] In discussing the problems which music teachers encounter in adjusting communities to the more functional views of music in modern education Wiebe contended that the community concept of a good music teacher was still influenced by the professional teacher of thirty years ago. The aim then was to win people to classical music from which developed a deep-rooted fetishism - a belief that classical music was good for one whether one liked it or not. A distinct dualism grew up between usable music and "good" music. One problem of the music

---

[17]Glenn. "The School Administrator and the Music Program." Music Educators National Conference Year Book, 1928, p. 65-71.

[18]Hetherinton. "The Administrator Evaluates His Music Program." Education 64: 146-147.

[19]Wiebe. "Relation of the Music Teacher to His Community." Educational Method 18: 417-424.

teacher today is to convince the community that desirable music for children must be defined in terms of its immediate utility in meeting the interests and needs of children instead of being defined in terms of structural form and authoritarian respectability.

It is important, therefore, that the music educator know what the community thinks about school music, for in the last analysis it will be community attitudes which will determine the answers to problems of functionalism in music education. Should the child be adjusted to music, or is music to serve children? Should music education continue to promote a double standard of school music, or should it throw the weight of its influence toward the promotion of a native musical expression? Should music be an expression of reactions to industrial, mechanized, modern life, or should it be a thing apart? In other words, should school music hold to "good" music, or should it allow boys and girls to redefine good music in terms of personal functional criteria? Will the community permit the music educator to sacrifice prestige of public performance if necessary to devote more attention to areas in child development to which music can contribute? Or, should the music director sacrifice calibre of performance to bring more attention to less apt students?

These are some of the issues which face the music educator in his relations with the community. He finds himself engaged in an activity which continues to grow in size and

numbers. He is aware that generally he enjoys the support and approbation of the public, but he is concerned about the negligible impact of his program upon the community which supports him. He is uneasy about the fact that applause for public performance is often the accepted barometer for indicating the educational excellence of his program.

Being musician as well as educator he feels that there is a distinction in the opinions of the public between musical values and the functional values of music to which he subscribes. If he is educator as well as musician he can see the importance of knowing what the community thinks about his program today, and what changes the community desires in his program tomorrow.

Need for research on attitudes of the community toward music education.

The preceding discussion indicates a need for research in aims and goals of music education particularly as they are influenced by community needs and desires. The public school was created to serve the educational needs of the people. Those needs must be evaluated again and again. The expression of public opinion, treated systematically, should provide a reliable approach to the problem of determining what services the public wants its schools to render.

In a democratic State the control of the schools is vested in authorities who receive their power to direct and

control educational processes from the will of the people. The public requires of the educational expert that he determine its needs and the best way to satisfy them. Two patterns of procedure are available for shaping the school to public needs. The authoritarian approach consists of informing the public of what the school proposes to do towards ends considered desirable by educators, and then leading and directing the thinking of the public toward those ends. The laissez faire approach, on the contrary, is based on being informed by the public and attempting to provide educational services accordingly. The two approaches are complementary; neither could be employed alone. For, if carried to an illogical extreme the one would result in autocracy or despotism, the other in anarchy or chaos. And the schools will suffer in proportion as the balance is shifted toward either end of a continum ranging between the two extremes.

It is a basic premise of this study that music education has been unduly influenced by the opinions of the professional musician and the professional educator, and that there is need for an evaluation of the opinions of the people whose ability to determine persistent values of music in social life has been amply demonstrated over the centuries.

The necessity for studying public opinion about the schools in general is indicated in the literature devoted to the subject. Miller believed that the schools had been selective in choosing the groups whose opinions were most

favorable at the moment.

> Conscientious teachers and administrators have always been alert to public opinion relating to the work of the schools. It has been the usual practice, to be sure, to listen more attentively to those citizens whose opinions counted for most when school issues were decided.[20]

To counter this tendency it is necessary that the attitudes of all the people be studied.

> The attitudes of students, parents, and citizen groups are powerful factors in shaping and influencing school policies. Unless the attitudes of such groups at large are known and taken into account, individual attitudes may appear which are not representative of those of the total group, and which may affect unfavorably the desirable shaping of school policies as judged according to the standards which the total group would approve.[21]

Any attempt to study the attitudes of the public toward its schools must be based on the assumption that the public is qualified to form and express an opinion. Again, the evidence from the literature would tend to support this assumption. "Upon any issue concerning school policies --- public opinions exist and exert influence upon the educational process."[22]

Seyfert maintained that it is more important to know what people think about the schools than to determine the extent of their knowledge.

---

[20] Miller. "Public Opinion Polls and Public Schools" Teachers College Record, 43: p. 245.

[21] Kibby. "Comparative Study of the Attitudes of Students, Parents, and Citizen Groups" American Association of College Registrars Journal 18: p. 149.

[22] Rope. "Opinion Conflict and School Support, p. 1.

> In the last analysis it is community feeling or opinion that determines the behavior of the people toward the schools. To ascertain what the public knows about its schools is undoubtedly important, but it is far more important to discover how the people feel about the schools.[23]

Goodykoontz confined her statements to one segment of the public, the parents of school children.

> Findings from a growing number of studies of what parents think about schools tend to show that parents know what they want schools to do for their children; they have ideas as to whether schools are serving their children satisfactorily, and they have a concept of their own educational role.
>
> Their evaluation may be non-technical, but it is on-the-spot, continuous, and probably influenced by their desire to have their children succeed in school.[24]

Thus far it has been indicated that there is a need for research on aims and goals of music education. The importance of ascertaining the attitudes of the public toward its schools has been demonstrated. This study has been undertaken in the assurance that the arguments and evidence presented justify further research on the attitudes of the public toward public school music. An extensive survey of the literature failed to reveal such studies.

---

[23]Seyfert. "What the Public Thinks of its Schools" School Review 48: p. 417.

[24]Goodykoontz. "Parents Know What They Want for Their Children" Educational Leadership 7: p. 286.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms have been used in the discussion thus far with the assumption that common understandings of the meanings of those terms are sufficient for the context in which they have been employed. It is pertinent that more precise definitions be established for critical terms which will be used in the discussion to follow.

Allport defined attitude as:

> - mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.[25]

An attitude is a system of ideas with an emotional content. It may be a belief which matters to the individual, or a prejudice or bias in favor of certain ideas. Thus, an attitude may be a predisposition to think as if belief were in line with fact, and it may also be a predisposition to act in certain ways when appropriate stimuli exist. When an individual expresses likes or dislikes, approval or disapproval, or gives an indication of his desires, he provides indices to beliefs which he holds to be true.

From this it follows that it is possible to measure a person's attitudes by asking him to state his beliefs. Such statements are valid measures of attitude from the logic of the preceding statements. The assumption generally made

---

[25] Allport. "Attitudes" Handbook of Social Psychology, p. 810.

that the verbal statement of belief is an adequate index to likely conduct in behavioral situations is not necessary in this study. In discussing the theory underlying the measurement of attitude Thurstone said:

> The measurement of attitudes expressed by a man's opinions does not necessarily mean the prediction of what he will do. If his expressed opinion and his actions are inconsistent, that does not concern us now, because we are not setting out to predict overt conduct. We shall assume that it is of interest to know what people say that they believe even if their conduct turns out to be inconsistent with their expressed opinions.[26]

Attitudes are not inborn. They are developed in the contacts the individual has with other persons, with his own performances, and with the environment. Allport listed four sources of attitudes:

1. Integration of numerous specific responses of a similar type.
2. Arising from general approach and withdrawal tendencies.
3. Resulting from single dramatic experiences.
4. Taken over ready-made from others.[27]

Allport considered the fourth source as the most important. Studies have shown that children tend to resemble parents in the specific attitudes they hold. The relationship has been found to be closer in the lower socio-economic groups.

Symonds listed several definitions of attitude encountered in the literature.[28]

---

[26]Thurstone and Chave. The Measurement of Attitude, p. 9.

[27]Allport, op. cit., p. 810.

[28]Symonds, "What is an Attitude?" Psychological Bulletin 24: 200 - 201.

1. The organic drives more familiarly known as purposes or motives.
2. Muscular set or adjustment.
3. Generalized conduct.
4. Neural set.
5. The emotional concomitant of action.
6. The feeling concomitant of action.
7. Certain verbal responses indicating liking or disliking, acceptance or rejection.

Symonds concluded that the definition used depended on what the investigator is studying.

This study was concerned with verbal responses. The assumption was made that the verbal response is an index to beliefs which the individual holds to be in line with fact. The term opinion will be used to designate such verbal responses. The term public opinion will be used with the meaning stated in the following definition from Rope:

> Public opinion may be simply defined as the consensus of the majority of any relatively large group whose attitudes regarding some specific issue or collection of issues are under consideration.[29]

A questionnaire is a list of questions to be answered verbally or in writing. The responses may vary depending on the type of question used. When used solely to elicit opinion the questionnaire is sometimes referred to as an opinionnaire and in a few instances as an expressionnaire. A questionnaire can contain a number of diverse items seeking information on a variety of subjects, related or unrelated. A poll usually refers to a survey of opinion on one specific issue.

---

[29]Rope, op. cit., p. 3.

An attitude scale is a device for measuring the strength and polarity of a given attitude. The item responses are assigned weights so that a net score can be expressed as an index on a scale ranging from high to low, more to less, positive to negative. Chiefly through the work of Thurstone the attitude scale has become a tool frequently resorted to in attitude research.[30]

Most of the criticism of the use of the questionnaire or attitude scale as a research tool is based on the difficulty of establishing the validity and reliability of the measuring instrument. The concept used as a basis for establishing the validity and reliability of the instrument used in this study is embodied in the following statement by Kirkpatrick:

> The degree to which human responses evoked by a particular method are consistent with a similar kind of responses evoked by the same method at another time under conditions assumed to be the same is a measure of the reliability of that method and of the results derived from it. When responses evoked by a particular method and assumed to have a certain meaning are consistent with another kind of response assumed to have a similar meaning, the method and its results are spoken of as having validity rather than reliability. The distinction is purely one of degree depending on the similarity of the two kinds of response.[31]

Reference has been made to the community. In the review of the literature the term will refer to various

---

[30]Thurstone. "Theory of Attitude Measurement" Psychological Review 36: 222 - 241.

[31]Kirkpatrick and Stone. "Attitude Measurement and the Comparison of Generations" Journal of Applied Psychology 19: 564 - 582.

aggregates and segments of the population depending on the scope of the particular study. In this study the community to be studied was established as the total adult population of a specified secondary school district plus the secondary school pupils of that district.

A sample is a segment of the total population drawn out for study purposes. A representative sample is one which reasonably duplicates the larger population in significant proportions and dimensions, only in miniature.

A distinction was made in this study between structured and unstructured opinion. The terms are not found generally in a review of the literature. They are necessary to delineate a concept which is basic in establishing the validity of the instrument used in the study. Structured is used in the sense of conforming to a pre-arranged order or plan. Applied to the gathering of opinions it refers to opinion secured under some measure of control by the investigator. Unstructured opinion refers to free expression of opinion, non-directed.

Review of Related Studies

The questionnaire has been criticized severely as a research tool. Yet, in spite of its limitations and defects, the questionnaire is being used in an increasing proportion of studies in the social fields today. In 1928, aware of a rising tide of opposition to the use of the questionnaire voiced by school administrators and others, Koos undertook an analysis of current and completed studies in the field of education.[32] He found, as anticipated, that the questionnaire was the one tool used most frequently. But, he also found upon careful analysis of the studies involving the use of the questionnaire solely that the nature of the problem required such means. "The astonishing fact --- is the almost negligible proportion which could have originated in any other method of investigation."[33]

Further confirmation of the prevalence of questionnaire-type studies is found in recent books on research methodology. Typical of the point of view encountered are these statements:

> The questionnaire is an important instrument in normative-survey research, being used to gather information from widely scattered sources. It is probably outranked in frequency of use only by the survey test.[34]

---

[32] Koos. The Questionnaire in Education.

[33] Ibid., p. 64

[34] Good, Barr, and Scates. The Methodology of Educational Research, p. 325.

> Questionnaires are not necessarily confined to statistical data, or even to factual material. They may enter the field of attitudes, opinions, and judgments. It is in these areas that great care must be observed. One must be careful in preparing his questionnaire and in interpreting his returns, to recognize opinion as such.[35]

When due care is exercised in constructing a questionnaire designed to elicit opinion solely, there should be no question raised as to the validity of the response.

> The opinions and attitudes represented are facts in so far as the responses are typical responses of the individual, but they are facts of opinion. --- These facts of opinion are different from opinion about facts, which are normally untrustworthy.[36]

Ahrens suggested a follow-up by personal interview to determine the accuracy of answers from returned questionnaires.[37] He concluded that the questionnaire method if properly administered and made up can bring valuable and worthwhile results.

Moehlman pointed out that survey activity has been in operation since 1845 in the instructional field.[38] It has been extended to the community only in the last three decades. He emphasized the need for continued survey-type research in these words: "In the past the lack of definite community information has retarded considerably the develop-

---

[35] Ibid., p. 330.

[36] Good, Barr, and Scates, op. cit., p. 332.

[37] Ahrens. "The Validity of the Questionnaire" Science Education 34: 41 - 42.

[38] Moehlman. Social Interpretation.

ment of a curriculum more closely adapted to community requirements."[39]

Romine listed twelve criteria for the construction of questionnaires which if adhered to carefully would result in practical research tools.

> As a research instrument the questionnaire and checklist have certain weaknesses. --- Nevertheless, for some studies they are about the only practical devices available, and, if carefully constructed and properly checked prior to use, they may serve the researcher well.[40]

This section will be devoted to a review of selected studies involving the use of the questionnaire to elicit opinions or expressions of attitude in the fields of general education, music, and music education.

General education studies involving the use of the questionnaire to elicit opinion.

The first three studies are reported in some detail because each one involves features which were considered in establishing the method used in this study. Rogers sought to obtain samples of public opinion of residents of varying geographical, cultural, and economic areas in Missouri regarding selected purposes of public education in that

---

[39] Ibid., p. 138.

[40] Romine. "Criteria for a Better Questionnaire" Journal of Educational Research 42: 69 - 71.

state.[41] He prepared an opinionnaire which was revised and corrected by the criticism of educational authorities. Information blanks went to the homes of each child in schools designated as representative of their counties by superintendents of schools. The validity of the information blank was established, according to Rogers, by agreement of educational experts. Rogers found a high degree of similarity in the opinions of the areas studied. There was more variation between the opinions of professional educators and the opinions of the public.

In view of the last result it would seem that the validity of the information blank as originally established by expert opinion is open to question. The sample in this study was limited to the parents of children in school. The results were claimed for the community at large, however.

James studied community opinion as to what is needed in a school public relations program by setting up seven publics concerned including parents, school board, ministerial association, service club directors, newspaper editors, and labor leaders.[42] The returns from parents were further stratified according to the occupational classification of the parent. The limitations of the sample were well defined, and the results were stated within those limitations.

---

[41] Rogers. "Public Opinion Regarding Selected Purposes of Education in Missouri," unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Missouri, 1949.

[42] James. "An Integrated Public Relations Program for Concordia, Kansas," unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Kansas, 1950.

Blum conducted a study to determine lay attitudes toward education in Montreal for the population as a whole, and to discover if there is a relationship between opinions and certain background factors: sex, language, age, religion, social status, and education.[43] He based the size of his sample on the criterion that it should be large enough so that an increased number of interviews would not change the results. Approximately thirty non-directed interviews were used to secure unstructured opinions from which a ballot was prepared. The ballot was pre-tested with another small sample to see if the questions were well worded and elicited the proper response. Representativeness of sample was assured by using the Chi-square test to determine goodness of fit of the sample with census information for certain background factors.[44]

The three preceding studies have been reported in some detail because of the close relation in method to the procedure established for this study. In the report of the studies following only those features which are related to the rationale underlying this study will be noted.

Remmers and Weltman found a strong positive relationship among members of the same family with respect to attitudes.[45]

---

[43]Blum. "Opinion Toward Education in Montreal, Canada," Journal of Experimental Education 15: 219 - 267.

[44]Johnson. Statistical Methods in Research, p. 63.

[45]Remmers and Weltman. "Attitude Inter-relationships of Youth, Their Parents, and Their Teachers," Journal of Social Psychology 26: 61-68.

They concluded that a fairly accurate measure of adult public opinion is obtainable by measuring the high school population.

Tenenbaum found a very low correlation between attitude toward school and such variables as I.Q., E.Q., absence, proficiency as demonstrated by grade marks, conduct, and grade progress.[46]

Mitchell conducted a study to determine validity and reliability by constructing a scale measuring attitude toward school using two forms which contained the same items re-arranged.[47] The scales were given three months apart, and the results were checked for validity against grades, honor points, and failures. He claimed reasonably high validity, and concluded that attitude scales toward school and school practices do have significance.

Todd constructed a questionnaire for determining what citizens know about their public schools.[48] This was not an attitude survey, but is reported here because in this instance Todd found that jury opinion as to what constituted significant items had to be abandoned for lack of unanimity.

---

[46]Tenenbaum. "School Attitude Questionnaire Correlated With Variables" Educational Administration and Supervision 27: 107 - 124.

[47]Mitchell. "Do Scales for Measuring Attitudes Have Any Significance?" Journal of Educational Research 34: 444 - 452.

[48]Todd. "What Citizens Know About Their Public Schools." Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education #279.

A study by Seyfert merits a more detailed analysis.[49] The study, concerned with what the public thinks of its schools, was made in only three communities, differing in size. This was based on the assumption that evidence from a small selected sample can be as dependable as that secured from a large random sample. The sample in each community was stratified according to the factors of sex, marital status, with-or-without children, age, real-estate ownership, and occupation. The questionnaire was submitted first to local groups, clubs, and organizational meetings, then the balance was restored to the sample by a door-to-door canvas. Seyfert found variation in responses within each community, but the same general pattern of responses for all three.

The opinionnaire has been used widely for pupil rating of teachers. Callahan reported that over 100 studies involving pupil rating scales had been conducted during the past twenty years.[50] Bryan in determining the reliability and validity of pupil rating scales found high reliability, and claimed that for the instrument used in the study reliability was synonomous with validity.[51]

---

[49]Seyfert. "What the Public Thinks of Its Schools." School Review 48: 417 - 427.

[50]Callahan. "Is Teacher Rating by Students a Sound Practice?" School and Society 69: 98 - 100.

[51]Bryan. "Pupil Rating of Secondary School Teachers" Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education #708.

The principal criticism of the studies reviewed concerns the validity of the instruments used to elicit opinion. This is in agreement with the findings of McNemar who undertook a critical review of the techniques and methodologies utilized in some 800 studies of opinions and attitudes.[52] He found that the bulk of the efforts involved a questionnaire or battery of questions selected on some a priori basis. Numerical values were assigned arbitrarily. The net score was interpreted as indicating the attitude of the respondents. Reliability was determined occasionally, but validity was seldom mentioned.

The review of related studies indicated that the usual procedure was to formulate a list of questions on the basis of expert opinion to be used to determine respondent opinion. The implicit assumption is that the expert knows in advance what are the commonly held opinions on the issue to be considered. A study developed on that basis is not a study of the opinions of the public entirely, but rather a measure of the public's acceptance or rejection of opinions imposed by outside authority. There is no guarantee that significant opinions have not been overlooked in the process. This procedure is used by all poll takers, but the problem involved is not one of determining the nature of opinion, but of measuring the strength of opinion about a previously established

---

[52]McNemar. "Opinion-attitude Methodology" Psychological Bulletin 43: 289 - 374.

issue. It is extremely important that the distinction be clearly made between "facts of opinion" and "opinions about facts."

The technique under criticism is one that is representative of the authoritarian approach to ascertaining educational needs. There it is necessary to know what the public thinks about items considered desirable by educators. This study attempted to elicit unstructured opinion as the basis for devising an instrument to measure the strengths and polarities of opinions so expressed. The study by Blum is noteworthy in this connection in that he used non-directed interviews at the beginning to secure information from which a ballot was prepared.

The importance of basing a study on unstructured opinion was stated by Likert:

> - the reactions on an attitude test are no more meaningful than the situation in which the attitude test was given. If the situation is such as to elicit the honest cooperation of the subject, so that he will be likely to state his own attitude and not the attitude that he thinks is expected of him or some equally fictitious attitude, we can feel that we have a valid measure of his attitude.[53]

The validity claimed for the instrument developed later in this study is based partially on the fact that the items in this instrument were first secured as unstructured opinion of a representative sample of a community population.

---

[53] Likert. "A Technique for Measuring Attitudes" Archives of Psychology 22: p. 33.

From this review of selected studies in general education it can be concluded that the questionnaire is an acceptable tool for research as evidenced by its use in the studies cited. Further, the questionnaire is apparently the only method available for sampling opinion and measuring attitude. The review of the research disclosed pertinent information about the construction and administration of questionnaires.

Music and music education studies involving the use of the questionnaire to elicit opinion.

The few attitude studies in the field of music and music education reported in this section represent the total number found in a survey of the volumes of the Education Index from July, 1929, to May, 1950. The Encyclopedia of Educational Research yielded references to selected bibliographies of research studies in music education.[54] An examination of these bibliographies provided the information which follows.

Kwalwasser in 1928 reported no studies on opinion, attitude, music and the community, or applications of the questionnaire technique to the field of music education.[55]

Murphy in 1931 reported a review of studies on

---

[54]Monroe. Encyclopedia of Educational Research.

[55]Kwalwasser. Research in High School Music, p. 383 - 396.

attitudes.[56] There were none on school issues including music education.

Bienstock in 1936 reported no studies on attitudes or opinions.[57] There was one study on the carry-over from school to community life.

Larson covering the years 1932 to 1948 listed thirteen studies involving attitudes and opinions, but none of them from the viewpoint of the community.[58]

Watson listed studies involving the application of character tests to the study of opinions, attitudes, and prejudices.[59] There were none on music or music education.

The one definitive study on attitudes of school children toward music was that of Gaston.[60] Using a questionnaire derived from unstructured opinions of a large sample of school children he determined the nature of their attitudes toward music, the strength and polarities of those attitudes, significant trends in the development of the attitudes, and what factors in the environment were related to the attitudes

---

[56] Murphy and Murphy. Experimental Social Psychology.

[57] Bienstock. "Report of National Survey of Experimental Projects in Music Education" Music Educators National Conference Yearbook 1936, p. 277 - 283.

[58] Larson. Bibliography of Research Studies in Music Education.

[59] Watson. "Character Tests and Their Applications Through 1930" Review of Educational Research II, #3, p. 183 - 270.

[60] Gaston. "A Study of the Trends of Attitudes Toward Music in School Children," unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Kansas, 1940.

shown.

Both Rutledge[61] and Glenn[62] employed questionnaires to determine the attitudes of school children toward music. The results of the two studies were contradictory largely because of the wording of the questions.

Dykema reported a school music survey made by a Teachers College team.[63] They used observation forms, a special questionnaire to determine attitudes, the Gildersleeve Music Attainment Test, and the Kwalwasser-Dykema Music Test. The results of the attitude survey were not reported in the reference cited.

McEarchen conducted a survey of school music teachers in the field to secure their opinions regarding professional needs.[64] Seashore and Hevner reported a study to demonstrate a device used in constructing a scale to be used to measure attitude toward music of people of different ages, training, geographical location, and other factors.[65] Fay and Middle-

---

[61]Rutledge. "Ascertaining Attitudes in Music," Music Supervisors Journal 15: 73 - 81.

[62]Glenn. "Ascertaining Attitudes Toward Music," Music Supervisors Journal 15: p. 75.

[63]Dykema. "Music in the School Survey," Music Supervisors Journal 17: 20 - 21.

[64]McEarchern. A Survey and Evaluation of the Education of School Music Teachers in the United States.

[65]Seashore and Hevner. "A Time-saving Device for the Construction of Attitude Scales," Journal of Social Psychology 4: 366 - 372.

ton studied the relationship between musical talent and preference for different types of music.[66]

With the exception of the study by Gaston, the review of literature for studies involving the use of the questionnaire to elicit opinion about music or music education between 1928 and 1950 fails to disclose any studies comparable to those reported in the field of general education. As far as can be ascertained there have been no studies on community attitudes toward music education.

In view of the arguments and citations indicating need for such studies, and with the evidence of a rapidly growing interest in community attitudes toward other phases of the educational process it must be concluded that the music educator has been concerned more with perfecting his skill as a musician and teacher than in determining aims and goals for his program.

In part this is due to the fact that the music educator is often first a musician, second a teacher concerned with a total educational program. In part, the emphasis placed on performance as a criterion of the excellence of a school program is at fault. This would indicate that further attention should be directed to the college curricula for the training of music teachers. Little change has been made in the basic curriculum presented in Bulletin Number One of the Music

---

[66]Fay and Middleton. "Relationship Between Musical Preference for Different Types of Music," Journal of Educational Psychology 32: 573 - 583.

Education Research Council for 1921. Recognition of this fact is found in the North Central Division Report for 1945 which recommends:

> There must be continued investigations of the curricula, particularly of teacher-training institutions, so that there will be increasingly better prepared teachers who, in turn, can be stimulated to research.[67]

The paucity of worth-while studies reported in this section amplifies the need for research on aims and goals in music education developed in a preceding section. The total lack of any research on the attitudes of the community toward school music supports the belief that there is a need for this particular study.

Summary

The history of the development of music as an art is marked by the growth of the dichotomy between "good" music and utilitarian music. Music in the schools largely followed a trend which was well established long before music entered the public school curriculum. The music education curriculum has been determined for the most part by professional musicians and professional educators. The result has been that school music has lost some of its identity with the musical life of the people. The music educator in his dual role of exponent of a formal art and community music agent needs to know what the community thinks about music education today,

---

[67] Morgan. Music Education Source Book, p. 43.

and what changes the community desires.

This study attempts to answer as specifically as possible the following questions:

1. What are the opinions of residents of selected communities in a specified area of Missouri regarding the music education program as practiced in their schools?

2. What significant differences of opinion between communities are apparent?

3. What factors could account for these differences of opinion?

4. What implications do these findings have for the practice of music education in the communities studied?

5. What implications do these findings have for the general practice of music education?

Chapter II

THE STUDY

Methods Used and Limitations

The purpose of this study was to inquire into the nature of attitudes toward school music as expressed in the opinions of pupils and adults, and to determine the strengths and polarities of commonly held opinions within selected communities. Ideally, the most valid method would be to secure unstructured opinion from every resident of the community. Not only would that be a practical impossibility, but the validity of such a method would still have to be based on the assumptions of ability on the part of every resident to express a reliable opinion and his willingness to do so. Responses requiring an expression of opinion open the way for insecurity on the criterion of ability especially.

If the two basic assumptions of ability and willingness may be granted for the moment, it then follows that the opinion of a community may be ascertained from a sample of that community if the sample can be shown to be representative of the community. The validity of such well-known public opinion polls as those conducted by Gallup and others is based in large part on the care taken to assure the representativeness of the sample polled.

Blankenship stated a guiding principle for selecting a sample.

> The fundamental principle is simply that a sample must be representative and that the question of size of the sample is a secondary consideration. A perfectly representative sample is one which is a perfect model of the total population to be sampled, paralleling the larger group in all its principal dimensions and proportions.[68]

He mentioned two methods of drawing a representative sample from a population. The first is based on purely random selection out of all the members of the larger group. This method was rejected for the present study because there is no guarantee that every member of a random sample will be willing to respond. It has been found that opinion polls conducted on random samples are apt to be biased by a disproportionate number of responses from the upper economic levels. The assumption here is that on social issues the people who have the most at stake are also better educated, better informed, and prone to be more articulate.

The method chosen by most poll takers is that of building up the sample as a working model of the larger group on the principle of stratification. The specification of randomness is still preserved in that every unit of the population to be represented has an equal chance to be included in the sample.

---

[68]Blankenship. How to Conduct Consumer and Opinion Research, p. 291.

Since the community to be studied was defined as the total adult population of a specified secondary school district plus the secondary school pupils of that district it was necessary to choose a factor for stratification of that community which would assure representativeness of sample.

In a typical community, school policies are influenced disproportionately by influential minority groups. It was important in this study that the sample be stratified by categories chosen so that pressure-group bias would be minimized. Ideally this would indicate that the sample should be selected at random, but also be proportionately representative of a variety of socio-economic factors including age, sex, occupation, income, size of family, real-estate ownership, length of residence in the community, union affiliation, religious preference, race or nationality background, education, rural-urban residence, and in this study, musical interests and background. Practically, this was impossible because of over-lapping of categories would negate the specification of random selection within categories. Every member of the community must have an equal chance to appear once only in the final sample.

The principal bias occuring in random samples when a mail ballot technique is employed is apt to be in the direction of the views of higher income levels. Gallup indicated that the usual low return on mail ballots was invariably

accompanied by this condition.[69] Johnson stated that questionnaire studies in which the sample selects itself are likely to represent mainly persons who have strong views on the issues.[70] On school issues this would indicate that parents would be apt to be more articulate than non-parents, and well-to-do parents more so than those who have less at stake in the schools economically or socially.

Since the principal bias occuring in random samples is related to economic level the factor chosen for stratification should be designed to minimize this. A sample stratified on the basis of occupational divisions should yield a return relatively free from upper level bias, and should include elements representative of other factors to be isolated for study, e.g. parents and non-parents. In a sense, any stratified sample will be biased in that it does not permit a return from pressure groups proportionate to the influence they are apt to wield in determining school policy. That bias is deliberate in this study in which opinion was sought from a representative sample of all economic levels in the community.

---

[69]Gallup. A Guide to Public Opinion Polls, p. 55.

[70]Johnson. Statistical Methods in Research, p. 189.

Selection of Representative Communities

An area for study was selected which consisted of all or part of fifteen counties in west-central Missouri. The area is predominantly rural with agriculture the principal occupation.

In that area there were seventy-nine communities of which seventy-four had public high schools with an enrollment of less than four hundred pupils in the upper four grades according to the 1950-51 Missouri school directory. The study was limited to those seventy-four schools since the first step in the study was to select communities which were reasonably representative of the entire area.

The seventy-four schools with enrollments in the upper four grades of less than four hundred were grouped arbitrarily into three divisions for study and comparison. Group A included those schools with 99 or less pupils in the upper four grades; group B, 100 to 299; and group C, 300 to 399. There were forty schools in group A, thirty in group B, and four in group C.

It was then necessary to select two communities in each group which could be assumed to be typical or representative of certain criteria considered to be pertinent in selecting a sample from which data of the study would be drawn. The criteria were stated in terms of:

1. Characteristics of the community.
2. Characteristics of the school program and plant in general.

3. Characteristics of the school music teacher.
4. Characteristics of the music education program in that school.

A jury of eight educators was asked to assist in making the selection of typical communities. Educators were chosen for this because it was felt that a professional educator familiar with all, or most, of the schools and communities in the area would be qualified to rank the communities according to the specified criteria. Each member of the jury was assumed to be reasonably well acquainted with the schools and communities in the area because of his position and years of residence in the area. The eight educators who served on the jury were:

1. Chairman of division of music, State College.
2. Director of field service, State College.
3. Director of placement bureau, State College.
4. Alumni secretary, State College.
5. Director of laboratory school, State College.
6. Chairman of division of industrial arts, State College.
7. District representative, state supervisor of instruction.
8. State supervisor of fine arts.

A ballot was prepared which contained information about the study, instructions to the jurors, and a list of the communities to be ranked, grouped into the three categories selected. The information and instructions

appeared on the ballot as follows:

A study of community attitudes toward music education in the public schools is to be made in a sample of communities within an area of a fifty mile radius. The study is to be limited to schools having less than 400 enrolled in the upper four grades. The schools are divided into three groups by enrollment as follows: Group A - under 100; Group B - 100 to 299; Group C - 300 to 399.

As a professional educator acquainted with the schools and communities in this area you are asked to choose the schools most typical of the area in each of the three categories. You are asked to consider the following criteria, discarding any school which is atypical with respect to any one of the criteria, and ranking the remainder according to the degree to which they approach a mean of the aggregate of the criteria.

Criteria:

1. Characteristics of the community including diversity of occupations within that community, mil assessment provided for the support of the schools, and extent of community musical activities.

2. The school program and plant including facilities provided for music education.

3. The music teacher in terms of preparation, experience, and tenure in the community.

4. The music education program in terms of scope, number of ensembles, size of ensembles, and percentage of participation.

One juror ranked only four communities in each category, one ranked twenty-two in the largest category, but six ranked five communities in each of the two larger categories. A frequency tabulation was prepared of the ranks assigned to communities ranked one through five only. From this the communities ranked most frequently one through five were selected; the ranks assigned to each were added; then divided by the number of judges ranking each community to secure an average rank. On the basis of the average rank so

obtained a tentative rank was assigned to each community. Roman numerals are used in this portion of the report to designate communities.

TABLE I

TENTATIVE SELECTION OF COMMUNITIES BY JURY

Community	Ranks given by jurors								Sum	f	Sum/f	Tentative rank
Group A												
I	1	2.5	2						5.5	3	1.8	1
II	2.5	1	3						6.5	3	2.2	2
III	3	3	2						8.0	3	2.7	3
IV	2.5	5	1						8.5	3	2.8	4
V	2	4	2	5					13.0	4	3.3	5
Group B												
I	2	2.5	1						5.5	3	1.8	1
II	1	4	1						6.0	3	2.0	2
III	2.5	5	1	3	4				15.5	5	3.1	3
IV	5	1	4						10.0	3	3.3	4
Group C												
I	2	1.5	1	3	3	2	1	1	14.5	8	1.8	1
II	1	1.5	3	4	1	1	2	4	17.5	8	2.2	2
III	4	1	2	3	4	3			17.0	6	2.8	3.5
IV	2	2	4	4	3	2			17.0	6	2.8	3.5

(One of the jurors did not rank the communities but did designate four in each category. Each of the four communities so designated was assigned an average rank of 2.5 in the above tabulation)

A second ballot was prepared on which the communities mentioned most frequently in the two larger categories were listed. A fifth community, mentioned by two jurors in the first survey was added to Group B so that there

would be an equal number in each category. This second ballot was submitted to the same jurors. The instructions to the jurors appeared on the ballot as follows:

> Recently you were asked to help select typical schools and communities in this area for a study on community attitudes toward music education which is to be made this year. From that survey the five communities mentioned most frequently in the two larger categories have been selected. They are listed below in alphabetical order.
>
> Will you please rank the communities in each category 1 through 5 by assigning rank 1 to the community which you consider the most typical of the group according the criteria considered in the original survey, rank 2 to the next most typical, and so on.

Following the same procedure as in the first survey an average rank was secured for each community. The ranks so obtained were compared with the tentative ranks assigned in the first survey.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE RANKS ASSIGNED BY JURORS, GROUP A

Community	Rank from 1st survey	Rank from 2nd survey
I	1	3
II	2	1
III	3	2
IV	4	4
V	5	5

Using the formula $R = \frac{6\Sigma d^2}{N^3 - N}$ a correlation of $R = .70$ was obtained for Group A. This indicated sufficient agreement to warrant the assumption that the jurors

had selected the three most typical communities in Group A on both ballots. The two communities ranked one and two on the second ballot were selected for study since each rank given on the second ballot represented the opinion of all eight of the jurors. For the remainder of the report those two communities are designated respectively as AI and AII.

TABIE III

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE RANKS ASSIGNED BY JURORS, GROUP B

Community	Rank from 1st survey	Rank from 2nd survey
I	1	4
II	2	2
III	3	1
IV	4	3
V	5	5

In comparing the results of the two surveys for Group B using the same formula as above a correlation of R = -.30 was obtained. Thus, at best, the second survey would seem to indicate that the jurors had confirmed that the community given rank 5 in the first survey was not considered to be one of the most typical communities in Group B. Of the four remaining communities the one designated as II was selected for study because it had been ranked second in both surveys, and community III was selected because it was ranked first on the second survey by eight jurors and was mentioned on the first survey by the greatest number of jurors (five). For

the remainder of the report those two communities are designated as BI and BII.

Since there were only four communities in the category referred to as Group C the results of the first survey were accepted as representative of the opinion of the eight jurors. The two communities ranked one and two on the first survey were selected for study, and are referred to in the remainder of the report as CI and CII.

In summary, an area was selected comprising seventy-four communities most representative in size of all the communities in the area. The seventy-four communities were grouped into three categories according to the secondary school enrollment of the public schools of the community. Two communities in each of the three categories were selected as representative of their respective categories.

Sampling the Opinions of Residents of Representative Communities

A form was prepared which consisted of two parts. One part designed to secure information about the respondent consisted of two sections, one to be used by adult respondents, the other for high school students. The rest of the form provided space for a free expression of opinions about the music education program in the school with which the respondent was concerned. In order to stimulate the thinking of the respondent so that he might express his opinions with a minimum of structuring five questions were asked which were to be answered in terms of likes and dislikes about the music program and the music teacher.

A letter accompanied each ballot mailed explaining the purpose of the survey, assuring the respondent of anonymity, and informing him that both the superintendent of schools and the director of music concerned approved of the study and gave their permission for the survey to be done. This approval was secured in advance of any publicity or mailing of materials.

Through the cooperation of the superintendent of schools and the music director in each community it was possible to make arrangements with the editors of each community newspaper to publish a story about the survey. This was timed to appear in the issue of the paper nearest in date to the mailing of the ballots.

The ballot was mailed to a random sample of the population of three communities, one in each size category, herein designated as communities AI, BI, and CI. For community AI, representative of the smallest of the three categories, the telepone directory was judged to be the most complete mailing list available by the superintendent of schools, editor of the community newspaper, and manager of the local telephone exchange. For community BI the telephone directory was also used. In the case of BI, however, the directory list included several rural lines which were not part of the reorganized school district centered in the schools of community BI. It was necessary for an official of the telephone company to indicate these lines, and those subscribers were eliminated from the population from which the sample was drawn.

In community CI one of the local merchants had compiled a mailing list by combining the telephone directory, the Missouri Public Service list of subscribers, and a list of school patrons. Proof sheets of this list were made available for this study.

The telephone directory lists were prepared by eliminating all professional and commercial listings which had residence duplications. The lists were separated into rural and urban addresses. One-third of the names on each list were selected at random by drawing lots to choose the first name among the first three listed, and drawing every third name thereafter.

Two weeks after mailing the ballots a card was sent to each address which had been included in the original mailing. The purpose of the card was to stimulate returns of the ballot and eliminate, if possible, the necessity of a later mailing of ballots.

The ballots returned were separated into adult and student returns. Comparatively few students responded to the mail ballot. In order to restore adult-student balance to the final sample it was necessary to compute the percentage of adult returns for each community in terms of the number of ballots mailed. These percentages were used to indicate the number of student responses needed to provide a sample which would be proportional among the three communities surveyed. An element of possible bias was introduced by this procedure in that the student responses would be representative of the total high school enrollment in the same proportion as the adult responses were representative of the sample selected (one-third of the adult population) rather than of the total adult population. This was necessary because because of the relatively low return on adult responses.

The additional student responses needed were secured by having unselected groups of students from grades nine to twelve fill out the questionnaire in study halls under the supervision of the investigator. Approximately one-third of the total high school enrollment was surveyed in this

manner in each case. Those ballots on which the response was incomplete were rejected. By random cast-out of the retained ballots a total student response was secured which was proportional to the adult response as indicated above.

In the preliminary phase of the study six communities were selected as representative of the communities of the area of the study. Unstructured opinions about the music education program in the schools of the communities were secured from a representative sample of the population of three of the six communities, each representative of one of the three size groups chosen for study.

Processing returns from original survey, and developing instrument used in second survey.

Each return was marked to identify the community from which it was derived. In the case of mail ballots the postmark supplied this information. The first step in tabulating the opinions from the sample returns was to construct a composite list of opinions from the three communities surveyed. Raw opinions were copied literally from the returns, identified by community, and grouped into five categories corresponding to the five questions used on the ballot to elicit opinion. Similar opinions were combined into inclusive statements when such combination did not destroy the original opinion or alter its intent. In most cases this involved only a rephrasing of several original statements to conform

to the wording of a single statement. In some cases a number of opinions dealing with specific aspects of a general condition were assumed to be opinions about the general condition. A general statement was phrased which would best represent the several specific statements. For instance, the following original statements were combined in this general statement: The music program provides an opportunity for all children to participate.

1. There is music for every child regardless of financial condition.
2. Lots of children get to know about music.
3. Everyone can participate regardless of special talent.
4. All pupils participate.
5. A program in which all children can take part.
6. All children have a chance to be in music groups.

All of the opinions were not as clear-cut as the above illustration might indicate. Where there was any question as to the advisability of interpreting a specific opinion in general terms the opinion was reported as a single opinion in its original form.

Identical opinions and general opinions were then entered in a frequency tabulation. The final form (TABLE IV) listed opinions in order of total frequency of mention within the framework of five categories corresponding to the five questions which were used to elicit the original opinions. Further, in the final tabulation, the opinions were divided into four sections. The first section consisted of common opinions, i.e., opinions expressed at least once in each of the three communities surveyed.

The second section listed opinions which were expressed at least once in any two of the three communities. The third section contained opinions expressed more than once in any one community. The last section was reserved for opinions which were expressed only once. These were listed by communities.

TABLE IV

OPINIONS EXPRESSED ON ORIGINAL SURVEY

Unstructured Opinions	Frequency AI	BI	CI	Total
Common opinions - three communities				
I. What are the things you like most about the music program in your schools?				
1. Provides opportunity for all children to participate.	3	9	24	36
2. The band, band concerts, band shows at games.	2	11	7	20
3. Variety of music used, both popular and classical.	2	3	11	16
4. Interesting, entertaining programs presented.	4	3	9	16
5. Fine music teachers.	3	6	4	13
6. Good grade music program - vocal and instrumental.	1	2	8	11
7. Program is conducted efficiently.	1	5	2	8
8. Contribution of band to community affairs.	1	3	2	6
9. Children learn to sing and/or play instruments.	1	1	2	4
10. Good discipline.	1	1	2	4
II. What are the things you dislike about the music program in your schools?				
1. Not enough equipment and facilities.	3	4	12	19
2. Choice of music, lack of variety, poor quality.	2	3	12	17
3. Not enough opportunity for more children to participate.	6	3	2	11
III. What changes would you like to see made in the way music is taught in your schools?				
1. Provide better facilities and equipment.	1	5	5	11
2. Present more programs.	1	1	8	10
3. More opportunities for participation.	4	3	3	10
4. Use more well-known music - popular, folk, hill-billy.	2	2	2	6
5. More stress on appreciation.	1	1	2	4

TABLE IV (Continued)

Unstructured Opinions	Frequency AI	BI	CI	Total
IV. What are the things you like most about your high school music teacher and the way he (or she) teaches?				
1. Personality in general.	3	6	14	23
2. Good teacher, does work well, gets results.	1	8	12	21
3. Well qualified, knows music, knows his job, good musician.	3	1	17	21
4. Sincerity, genuine interest in music and individual pupils.	2	7	12	21
5. Good disciplinarian.	6	2	7	15
6. Understanding of individual differences, ability to get the most out of students.	2	7	3	12
7. Patience.	2	6	3	11
8. Cooperative attitude, secures cooperation of students.	2	2	2	6
V. What are the things you dislike most about your high school music teacher and the way he (or she) teaches?				
1. Too critical and outspoken, lacks tact, too strict.	1	3	5	9
2. Loses patience and temper.	1	1	4	6
3. Poor discipline.	1	1	4	6
Frequent opinions - two communities				
I. Things liked about the program.				
1. Children enjoy music, become interested through participation.	0	3	11	14
2. General benefits from music training.	3	0	7	10
3. Individual instruction, individual attention.	0	1	5	6
4. Extensive and varied program.	0	2	4	6
5. Children learn fundamentals, how to read music.	1	0	4	5
6. Good equipment.	0	1	2	3
7. Selective ensembles reward effort and ability.	0	1	2	3
8. The experience of playing solos and in small ensembles.	0	2	1	3
9. Good ensembles.	0	1	1	2
10. Music numbers are well prepared.	0	1	1	2
11. Taking part in clinics and festivals.	0	1	1	2

TABLE IV (Continued)

Unstructured Opinions	Frequency AI	BI	CI	Total
II. Things disliked about the program.				
1. Not enough programs presented.	0	7	16	23
2. The way music is taught.	1	0	8	9
3. Not enough emphasis on grade music, junior band.	3	0	5	8
4. Music not emphasized enough in the school program.	0	3	5	8
5. Program too expensive.	0	2	5	7
6. Teacher's personality.	0	1	5	6
7. Not enough rehearsal time.	0	2	3	5
8. Schedule conflicts, all can't take part.	0	1	4	5
9. Poorly qualified teachers.	2	0	2	4
10. No opportunity for community participation.	3	0	1	4
11. Program is weak, lacking in enthusiasm, on the down-grade.	0	1	2	3
12. No orchestra or string training.	0	1	1	2
III. What changes would you like.				
1. More variety in types of music used.	0	1	8	9
2. More time given to instrumental beginners and grade program.	0	1	8	9
3. More individual attention.	3	0	4	7
4. More time should be allowed for music.	0	2	3	5
5. More classical music.	1	0	3	4
6. Start string program and orchestra.	0	2	2	4
7. More attention to fundamentals.	2	0	1	3
8. More festivals, less emphasis on contests.	0	1	2	3
9. More sight reading, less repetition in practice.	1	0	2	3
10. Let pupils have part in choosing music.	0	2	1	3
11. Make chorus selective after learning fundamentals in Glee Club.	1	0	1	2
IV. What do you like about the teacher.				
1. Developed fine band.	0	7	1	8
2. Good selection of music used, variety.	0	2	4	6
3. Makes pupils want to take part.	1	0	4	5
4. Students have part in making decisions democratically.	0	1	4	5
5. Good community relations.	0	3	1	4

TABLE IV (Continued)

Unstructured Opinions	Frequency AI	BI	CI	Total
6. Good director.	0	1	3	4
7. Sets good example for students.	0	2	1	3
8. No favoritism shown.	1	0	2	3
9. Teaches fundamentals.	0	1	2	3
10. Sense of humor.	1	1	0	2
V. What do you dislike about the teacher.				
1. Not friendly with the townspeople.	1	0	5	6
2. Does not try to get along with the pupils.	1	0	4	5
3. Too mercenary.	0	4	1	5
4. Doesn't encourage boys to sing.	0	2	1	3
5. Poorly prepared.	1	0	2	3
6. Students don't have enough choice.	0	1	2	3
7. Does not show interest in students.	1	0	1	2
8. More time should be given to music.	1	1	0	2

Frequent opinions - one community

	Community	Frequency
I. Things liked about the program.		
1. Teaches music appreciation.	CI	4
2. Children learn part singing to use in adult life.	CI	2
3. Separate teachers - vocal and instrumental.	BI	2
4. Helps develop talent.	CI	2
5. Students have part in planning program.	AI	2
II. Things disliked about the program.		
1. School should furnish instruments.	CI	4
2. Not enough singing done in class.	CI	4
3. Fundamentals not taught.	CI	4
4. Bad feeling between teacher and students.	CI	3
5. Poor attendance at musical programs.	CI	2
6. Lack of discipline.	AI	2
7. No systematic way of entering or leaving stage.	CI	2
III. What changes would you like.		
1. Better relations between pupils and teacher.	CI	5
2. Schedule music to avoid class conflicts.	CI	3
3. Separate instrumental and vocal with qualified teachers.	CI	3

TABLE IV (Continued)

Unstructured Opinions	Community	Frequency
4. More varied ensembles with school time provided.	CI	2
5. More attention to those who can't sing and be in chorus.	CI	2
6. Divide band into beginners and advanced.	BI	2
7. Get older boys in glee club.	BI	2
8. Need another teacher for junior band.	CI	2
IV. What do you like about the teacher.		
1. Started instrumental classes for grade school.	CI	2
2. Has lots of good ideas.	CI	2
V. What do you dislike about the teacher.		
1. Teacher is arrogant, narrow-minded, aggressive, self-centered.	CI	11
2. Teacher is not impartial.	CI	8

Opinions expressed once

I. Things liked about the program.

Community AI

1. Provides music for all school functions.
2. Music creates friendship.
3. Music builds character.
4. Separate boys and girls glee clubs gets more done.
5. It gives a chance to see what kind of music is taught children.

Community BI

1. Program has improved over the years.
2. Good community support.
3. Music encourages the children.

Community CI

1. Music provides an emotional outlet.
2. Some songs teach reverence for religious and patriotic ideals.

TABLE IV (Continued)

Unstructured Opinions

3. Parent's organizations support the program.
4. Music is emphasized in the curriculum.
5. Contest participation creates interest.
6. The cooperation and support of the administration.
7. Students are making good progress.
8. Good quality of voices.
9. Pupils are willing to work together.

II. Things disliked about the program.

Community AI

1. Band doesn't keep together.
2. Music should not be a required subject, but everyone should have the privilege of taking it.
3. Should practice on stage more.
4. Some programs too long.

Community BI

1. Not enough music for the public during the summer.
2. Music is taught for economic gain rather than musical values.
3. Pupils should have practice periods on school time.
4. Not enough emphasis on enjoyment.
5. Older boys not encouraged to sing.
6. Need combined chorus.
7. Too much extra-curricular, too much time spent outside of school hours.
8. Teacher shows partiality.
9. Pupils have no choice of music.
10. Don't like music appreciation.
11. Tendency to make musical organizations an adjunct to the athletic program.
12. Grade children can't earn letters in band.

Community CI

1. No provision for children who play non-standard instruments.
2. Too much emphasis on spring contests.
3. Should have separate instructors for vocal and instrumental.
4. Instructors should be paid more.
5. Vocal solos.
6. Programs are not long enough.
7. Too few students have solo parts and do accompanying.
8. In glee club he chooses wrong sections or voice for some kids to sing.

TABLE IV (Continued)

Unstructured Opinions

III. What changes would you like.

Community AI

1. Keep public informed of activities.
2. Needs piano accompanist so he can concentrate on students.
3. Students should be taken to the city to hear musical programs.
4. Practice as though an audience were present.

Community BI

1. Have summer concert programs.
2. Require high school students to join vocal groups.
3. Encourage better attendance at programs.
4. Do away with music appreciation - no value to most students.
5. More carry-over from school to community and church.

Community CI

1. Teacher should be stricter.
2. More music - less show.
3. Spend less on uniforms.
4. More solos and small ensembles.
5. Better salaries.
6. More marching.
7. More unison playing for intonation.
8. Teacher ought to let glee club go to contest.
9. Revise the point system.
10. Teach music slower - plays too fast at first.
11. Not have to stand in front of everybody and sing pieces alone.
12. Students outside band should know more of its activities.
13. Should get six-weeks grades in band and chorus.

IV. What do you like about the teacher.

Community AI

1. Does good work in the grades.
2. Music should be classed with the most important subjects in school.
3. Makes the course easy, but still learn things.

TABLE IV (Continued)

Unstructured Opinions

Community BI

1. They provide opportunity to know and enjoy music.
2. She lets you sing a lot.

Community CI

1. Is willing to have special music programs.
2. He is lenient in his instructions.
3. Does not teach enough about music.
4. Teaches to sing the words correctly.
5. Makes you go back and correct your mistakes.
6. Very informal.
7. Has sectional rehearsals.
8. Tries to get everybody in music groups who wants to be in.
9. Works for perfection.
10. The way he gives grades.

V. What do you dislike about the teacher.

Community AI

1. Music should not be crowded out by athletics.
2. Band does not keep together.
3. Don't do enough, just sing out of books.

Community BI

1. Not enough individual attention.
2. Too many little kids in band.
3. Tests too hard to understand.

Community CI

1. Not enough singing in glee club.
2. Teacher should have fine background in music appreciation.
3. Should teach proper respect for songs and musical instruments.
4. Teacher doesn't get enough pay.
5. Teaches too much popular music.
6. Tries to teach pupils too fast.
7. Has difficulty getting ideas across to students.
8. Will not cooperate with other teachers.

TABLE IV (Continued)

Unstructured Opinions
9. Not enough band activity.
10. Several students have discontinued band.
11. Expects pupils to be able to read music.
12. Don't have assembly often enough.
13. Doesn't go about right way in teaching songs.
14. Teaches music because it is his job - no pleasure in it.
15. Doesn't divide glee club properly when they sing.
16. The way he teaches and directs.

The raw data of the first survey tabulated as indicated, listed the opinions of residents of three selected communities about the music education program in those communities. The next step was to devise an instrument for measuring the strengths of those opinions in the original three communities and in three other communities chosen to be equally representative of the total area of the survey.

The opinions chosen to be tested were those common to all three communities. The reasons for this choice were both practical and ideal. It was decided that the form of the final instrument be limited to one page printed on both sides which would include both information about the respondent and selected test items. Ideally, opinions common to the first three communities should be more apt to represent opinions commonly held by residents of the other three equated communities. Thus, opinions related to conditions peculiar to one or two communities were eliminated.

Each of the chosen opinions, thirty in all, was rephrased where necessary in the form of a statement about which the respondent would express his opinion by agreeing or disagreeing. Space was provided for the respondent to express his opinion about each statement by checking YES if he agreed with the statement, NO if he disagreed, or

NO OPINION if he had no opinion as to whether the statement was true or not, or if he felt that it did not apply to his school.

The original five categories were retained, but the order of listing the items in each category was determined by drawing numbers representing each item from a hat. This was done to eliminate the possibility of suggesting a patterned response to the respondent if the items were presented in the order of frequency of mention.

Space was provided after each group of statements for the respondent to indicate the particular item about which he had the strongest feeling of like or dislike. This was done to provide a basis for ranking the item in each category according to frequency of choice by the respondents.

In its final form the instrument was made into separate questionnaires for adults and students. Only the questions requesting information about the respondent were different. The test items were the same on both forms. The experience with the first survey indicated that few students would respond to a mail ballot.

Each form contained a section for securing information about the respondent to be used in analyzing the data. The thirty test items corresponding to the thirty common opinions expressed in the first survey were arranged in five groups corresponding to the five questions originally used to elicit unstructured opinion.

Group A - Things liked about the way music is taught.
Group B - Things disliked about the way music is taught.
Group C - Changes desired in the program.
Group D - Things liked about the teacher and/or the way he/she teaches.
Group E - Things disliked about the teacher and/or the way he/she teaches.

The unstructured opinions secured from a representative sample of the population of three representative communities were processed by categorization, generalization and modification. The unstructured opinions common to all three communities were used to formulate the test items used in an instrument designed to measure strengths of the original opinions in a representative sample of six representative communities.

Testing Opinion Strengths on a Sample of Residents of Representative Communities

In the first phase of the study six representative communities were chosen to be surveyed. Two communities were chosen to be representative of each of the three size categories in which all of the communities within the area of the study were grouped. Unstructured opinions about the music education program in each community were secured in three communities, one from each size category, designated as communities AI, BI, and CI. An instrument was devised for testing strengths of common opinions disclosed by the first survey.

The next step was to submit the test instrument to a representative sample of the residents of all six communities. The approval of the superintendent of schools and the director of music was secured in the second group of communities designated as AII, BII, and CII. Letters of approval from superintendents and teachers concerned were incorporated in separate letters of explanation to be sent with each mail ballot. It was hoped that this would help to stimulate returns so that a higher percentage of returns would be elicited than in the initial survey.

As in the first survey suitable newspaper publicity was arranged in each of the six communities. Copy for the newspaper story used in communities AI, BI, and CI is included in the Appendix to this report. The same copy was used for AII, BII, and CII as was used originally for AI, BI, and CI.

Test forms and letters of explanation were mailed to a random sample of the population of all six communities. In both surveys the mail ballots included an addressed envelope requiring no postage for returning the items to the investigator.

The same mailing lists were used in communities AI, BI, and CI for both surveys. Community AII was a rural community in the center of a reorganized school district. There was no local telephone exchange, and no comprehensive list of the population was available. It was necessary to address envelopes for distribution by the postmaster to every resident, local and rural. In the other five communities one-sixth of the population was selected at random for the second survey. The possibility that the sample from community AII would introduce an element of bias in the total sample was relatively unimportant since the sample was to be tested for representativeness. Telephone directories were used for the mailing lists in communities BII and CII. These lists were processed as in the first survey so that duplications were eliminated and the population was divided into rural and urban residents. One-sixth of the names were drawn at random. The first name was selected by lot, and every sixth name thereafter.

The names used in the first survey were excluded from the population of communities AI, BI, and CI. It was desired that an unbiased sample be drawn from the communities

from which the original opinions were derived. One-fourth of the remaining two-thirds names were selected at random. The first name was selected by lot, and every fourth name thereafter.

As before, cards were mailed to every person who received a mailed copy of the test form to stimulate returns.

Since separate forms were used for adults and students it was necessary to sample student opinion by personal solicitation. Approximately one-third of the high school enrollment of each school was included in the sample. This was based on the assumption that the anticipated adult return would not exceed one-third of the total number of test forms mailed. Test forms were filled out in classes and study halls under the supervision of the investigator by groups of students from grades nine to twelve. Attempts were made to select students who had not participated in the first survey but some overlapping was inevitable.

Six communities were chosen by jury opinion to be representative of the seventy-four communities included in the area chosen for study. Unstructured opinions about the music education program in the schools of three of the six communities were secured. A structured instrument was devised for testing the strengths of common opinions disclosed in the first survey. The instrument was submitted to a sample of the population of all six communities.

CHAPTER III

REPORT OF DATA

In the first phase of the study a survey was conducted in three representative communities which elicited opinions about the music education program in those communities. The opinions so derived were reported in full in TABIE IV, Chapter II. The thirty common opinions are listed in TABIE V, not in order of frequency of mention but in the order in which they appeared on the instrument developed for the second survey. In the tabular data which follows these items are referred to by group and number as they appear in TABIE V.

TABIE V

COMMON OPINIONS, THREE COMMUNITIES, FIRST SURVEY

Item	Unstructured opinions
Group A:	What do you like about the way music is taught in your schools?
A1.	We have a fine music teacher (or teachers).
A2.	We have good instruction for beginners on instruments in the elementary grades.
A3.	Children learn to sing and/or play instruments.
A4.	In general, music is taught and conducted efficiently.
A5.	The music department presents interesting and entertaining programs.
A6.	The high school band takes part in community affairs.
A7.	General music is taught well in the elementary grades.
A8.	A variety of music is used, both popular and classical.

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Unstructured opinions
A9.	There is an opportunity for every child to take part in some music activity who wants to.
A10.	The teacher is a good disciplinarian.
A11.	We have a very good high school band.
Group B:	What do you dislike about the way music is taught in your schools?
B1.	There is not enough opportunity for all the children to take part in music activities who want to.
B2.	The music lacks variety, or is of poor quality.
B3.	Our school does not have enough equipment or good facilities for the music program.
Group C:	What changes would you like to see in the way music is taught in your schools
C1.	The music groups should present more public programs.
C2.	More well-known music should be used - popular, folk, and/or hill-billy.
C3.	More opportunities should be provided for more children to take part in some music activity.
C4.	The school should provide better facilities and equipment for the teaching of music
C5.	Teachers should put more emphasis on teaching children to appreciate good music.
Group D:	What do you like about your music teacher and/or the way he/she teachers?
D1.	Our music teacher knows how to teach well, does good work, and gets results.
D2.	Our teacher understands individual differences and is able to get the most out of individual pupils.
D3.	Our teacher has a cooperative attitude, and is able to secure the cooperation of the pupils.
D4.	Our music teacher has a fine personality in general.
D5.	Our teacher is sincere, has a genuine interest in music and in individual pupils.

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Unstructured Opinions
D6.	Our teacher is very patient.
D7.	Our teacher is a good disciplinarian.
D8.	Our teacher is well-qualified, knows a lot about music, and is a good musician.
Group E:	What do you dislike about your music teacher and/or the way he/she teaches?
E1.	Our teacher is a poor disciplinarian.
E2.	Our music teacher is too critical and outspoken, lacking tact, too strict.
E3.	Our teacher loses patience and temper too easily.

The thirty items listed above were common opinions in that each was mentioned at least once in returns from all three communities surveyed. TABLE VI is a report of frequency of mention of each item in the three communities with the ranks assigned to each item on the basis of frequency of mention.

TABLE VI

RANK ORDER OF ITEMS, FIRST SURVEY

Item	Community							
	AI		BI		CI		Total	
	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r
A1	3	2.5	6	3	4	7	13	5
A2	1	8.5	2	8.5	8	4.5	11	6.5
A3	1	8.5	1	10.5	2	9.5	4	10.5
A4	1	8.5	5	4	2	9.5	8	8
A5	4	1	3	6	9	3	16	3.5
A6	1	8.5	3	6	2	9.5	6	9
A7	1	8.5	2	8.5	8	4.5	11	6.5
A8	2	4.5	3	6	11	2	16	3.5
A9	3	2.5	9	2	24	1	36	1
A10	1	8.5	1	10.5	2	9.5	4	10.5
A11	2	4.5	11	1	7	6	20	2
B1	6	1	3	2.5	2	3	11	3
B2	2	3	3	2.5	12	1.5	17	2
B3	3	2	4	1	12	1.5	19	1
C1	1	4	1	4.5	8	1	10	2.5
C2	2	2	2	3	2	4.5	6	4
C3	4	1	3	2	3	3	10	2.5
C4	1	4	5	1	5	2	11	1
C5	1	4	1	4.5	2	4.5	4	5
D1	1	8	8	1	3	6.5	21	3
D2	2	5.5	7	2.5	3	6.5	12	6
D3	2	5.5	2	6.5	2	8	6	8
D4	3	2.5	6	4.5	14	2	23	1
D5	2	5.5	7	2.5	12	3.5	21	3
D6	2	5.5	6	4.5	3	6.5	11	7
D7	6	1	2	6.5	7	5	15	5
D8	3	2.5	1	8	17	1	21	3
E1	1	2	1	2.5	4	2.5	6	2.5
E2	1	2	3	1	5	1	9	1
E3	1	2	1	2.5	4	2.5	6	2.5

The instrument used in the survey of all six selected communities also requested that the respondent indicate the item in each group about which he held the strongest opinion with reference to the question under consideration. Some of the respondents did not reply to this portion of the questionnaire. It was assumed that the respondent felt that the particular items did not apply, or that he was unable to judge the relative weight of each item. In a few cases more than one item was indicated. In such cases each response was given equal weight in the final tabulation. The results are reported by community divided into adult(Ad), student (St), and total response (T), and listed by item, frequency of selection of item, and rank assigned on the basis of frequency of selection.

TABLE VII

RANK ORDER OF ITEMS, SECOND SURVEY

Item	Community											
	AI						AII					
	Ad.		St.		Total		Ad.		St.		Total	
	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r
A1	3	4	8	2	11	2	0	8	1	7	1	7.5
A2	1	7.5	0	9.5	1	9	0	8	0	10	0	10.5
A3	2	5	2	5	4	5	5	1	3	3	8	3
A4	0	10.5	1	6.5	1	9	0	8	1	7	1	7.5
A5	1	7.5	0	9.5	1	9	0	8	2	4.5	2	4.5
A6	0	10.5	3	4	3	6	1	3.5	0	10	1	7.5
A7	1	7.5	0	9.5	1	9	0	8	1	7	1	7.5
A8	4	2	4	3	8	3	2	2	7	2	9	2
A9	4	2	9	1	13	1	1	3.5	12	1	13	1
A10	1	7.5	0	9.5	1	9	0	8	2	4.5	2	4.5
A11	4	2	1	6.5	5	4	0	8	0	10	0	10.5
B1	5	2	8	2	13	2	4	3	1	3	5	3
B2	1	3	3	3	4	3	5	2	18	1	23	1
B3	14	1	14	1	28	1	6	1	10	2	16	2
C1	2	4	0	5	2	5	1	5	3	4.5	4	5
C2	2	4	10	2	12	2	2	3.5	17	1	19	1
C3	2	4	1	4	3	4	2	3.5	3	4.5	5	4
C4	8	1	13	1	21	1	6	2	4	3	10	3
C5	7	2	4	3	11	3	7	1	10	2	17	2
D1	5	2	9	1	14	1	1	4.5	1	5.5	2	5
D2	0	8	1	6.5	1	7.5	0	7	1	5.5	1	6
D3	2	5.5	1	6.5	3	6	0	7	0	7.5	0	7.5
D4	6	1	4	3.5	10	2.5	2	2.5	10	2	12	2
D5	4	3	6	2	10	2.5	2	2.5	2	3.5	4	3
D6	2	5.5	3	5	5	5	4	1	14	1	18	1
D7	1	7	0	8	1	7.5	0	7	0	7.5	0	7.5
D8	3	4	4	3.5	7	4	1	4.5	2	3.5	3	4
E1	3	1.5	1	3	4	3	6	1	17	1	23	1
E2	2	3	4	2	6	2	1	3	6	2	7	2
E3	3	1.5	9	1	12	1	2	2	4	3	6	3

TABLE VII (Continued)

Item	Community											
	BI						BII					
	Ad.		St.		Total		Ad.		St.		Total	
	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r
A1	5	2	5	6	10	4.5	7	1	7	5.5	14	4
A2	0	11	1	10.5	1	11	4	5	3	8	7	8
A3	1	8.5	1	10.5	2	10	1	8.5	2	9.5	3	9.5
A4	1	8.5	4	7	5	7	4	5	6	7	10	6.5
A5	2	5.5	8	4	10	4.5	6	2.5	28	2	34	2
A6	2	5.5	14	1	16	2	4	5	7	5.5	11	5
A7	1	8.5	3	8	4	8	0	10.5	0	11	0	11
A8	3	4	6	5	9	6	0	10.5	21	3	21	3
A9	9	1	10	2.5	19	1	6	2.5	37	1	43	1
A10	1	8.5	2	9	3	9	1	8.5	2	9.5	3	9.5
A11	4	3	10	2.5	14	3	2	7	8	4	10	6.5
B1	4	2	15	3	19	2	5	2	40	1	45	1
B2	1	3	17	2	18	3	2	3	27	2.5	29	3
B3	16	1	22	1	38	1	11	1	27	2.5	38	2
C1	3	5	2	5	5	5	5	3	15	3	20	3
C2	5	3.5	29	1	34	1	3	4	59	1	62	1
C3	6	2	3	4	9	4	7	2	10	4	17	4
C4	10	1	14	2	24	2	10	1	5	5	15	5
C5	5	3.5	13	3	18	3	2	5	35	2	37	2
D1	7	2	5	5	12	4	6	3	21	3	27	3
D2	1	6	4	6.5	5	7	4	4.5	8	5.5	12	5.5
D3	7	2	3	8	10	5	4	4.5	8	5.5	12	5.5
D4	2	5	13	2	15	2	3	6	28	2	31	2
D5	7	2	7	3	14	3	7	1.5	14	4	21	4
D6	0	7.5	6	4	6	6	0	7.5	7	7	7	7
D7	0	7.5	4	6.5	4	8	0	7.5	0	8	0	8
D8	5	4	15	1	20	1	7	1.5	34	1	41	1
E1	3	1	3	3	6	3	2	1	9	3	11	3
E2	2	2	11	2	13	2	0	3	17	2	17	2
E3	1	3	29	1	30	1	1	2	53	1	54	1

TABLE VII (Continued)

Item	Community											
	CI						CII					
	Ad.		St.		Total		Ad.		St.		Total	
	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r	f	r
A1	1	7	6	6.5	7	6.5	6	4	14	3	20	4
A2	1	7	2	10	3	9	4	6.5	1	9	5	8
A3	1	7	7	5	8	5	2	10.5	1	9	3	10
A4	0	10.5	3	8.5	3	9	5	5	2	7	7	7
A5	5	2	17	4	22	3	3	8.5	8	5	11	6
A6	1	7	6	6.5	7	6.5	11	2	3	6	14	5
A7	2	3.5	0	11	2	11	2	10.5	0	11	2	11
A8	2	3.5	23	2	25	2	4	6.5	18	2	22	3
A9	7	1	33	1	40	1	10	3	13	4	23	2
A10	0	10.5	3	8.5	3	9	3	8.5	1	9	4	9
A11	1	7	19	3	20	4	12	1	30	1	42	1
B1	4	2	26	3	30	2.5	14	1	29	1	43	1
B2	2	3	28	2	30	2.5	3	3	20	2	23	2
B3	10	1	51	1	61	1	8	2	14	3	22	3
C1	4	2	15	4	19	4	6	3	12	3	18	4
C2	3	3.5	48	1	51	1	3	5	31	1	34	2
C3	5	1	10	5	15	5	11	2	11	4	22	3
C4	3	3.5	21	2	24	2	4	4	10	5	14	5
C5	2	5	19	3	21	3	16	1	22	2	38	1
D1	3	2.5	20	3	23	3	16	1	16	3	32	2
D2	1	5.5	3	7	4	6.5	3	6	6	5	9	6
D3	0	7.5	3	7	3	8	6	4	4	7	10	5
D4	3	2.5	23	2	26	2	5	5	18	2	23	3
D5	2	4	8	5	10	4.5	13	2.5	8	4	21	4
D6	0	7.5	10	4	10	4.5	2	7	5	6	7	7
D7	1	5.5	3	7	4	6.5	1	8	1	8	2	8
D8	8	1	24	1	32	1	13	2.5	32	1	45	1
E1	4	2.5	14	3	18	3	7	1	13	1.5	20	1
E2	7	1	20	2	27	2	2	3	10	3	12	3
E3	4	2.5	36	1	40	1	4	2	13	1.5	17	2

TABLE VII (Continued)

Item	Totals					
	AI, BI, CI		AII, BII, CII		AI, BI, CI AII, BII, CII	
	f	r	f	r	f	r
A1	28	5	35	5	63	5
A2	5	11	12	9	17	9
A3	14	7	14	8	28	7
A4	9	8	18	7	27	8
A5	33	4	47	4	80	4
A6	26	6	26	6	52	6
A7	7	9.5	3	11	10	11
A8	42	2	52	2.5	94	2
A9	72	1	79	1	151	1
A10	7	9.5	9	10	16	10
A11	39	3	52	2.5	91	3
B1	62	2	93	1	155	2
B2	52	3	75	3	127	3
B3	127	1	76	2	203	1
C1	26	5	42	4	68	5
C2	97	1	115	1	212	1
C3	27	4	44	3	71	4
C4	69	2	39	5	108	3
C5	50	3	92	2	142	2
D1	49	3	61	3	110	3
D2	10	7	22	6.5	32	7
D3	16	6	22	6.5	38	6
D4	51	2	66	2	117	2
D5	34	4	46	4	80	4
D6	21	5	32	5	53	5
D7	9	8	2	8	11	8
D8	59	1	89	1	148	1
E1	28	3	54	2	82	2.5
E2	46	2	36	3	82	2.5
E3	82	1	77	1	159	1

The instrument used in the second survey was designed to determine the strengths of common opinions within six selected communities. The respondent indicated his opinion about each item in the questionnaire by checking YES if he agreed with the statement or felt it was true, NO if he disagreed, NO OPINION if he did not know whether the statement was true or not, or felt that it did not apply to the music education program in his community. When the respondent did not indicate an opinion on a particular item it was recorded as NO OPINION.

The results are reported by community and by totals. Within communities the results are divided into adult responses (Ad), student responses (St), and total (T). The number of respondents in each category is indicated. The results are listed by item and opinions (OPIN) about each item (YES - Y, NO - N, and NO OPINION - NO). The opinions are tabulated by frequency of selection and percent of the total responding to each item. Total responses are reported for communities AI, BI, and CI combined, for communities AII, BII, and CII combined, and for all six communities.

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OBTAINED IN COMMUNITIES WITH INSTRUMENT USED IN SECOND SURVEY

ITEM	OPIN	Community AI						Community AII					
		Ad - 24		St - 30		T - 54		Ad - 17		St - 33		T - 50	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
A1	Y	16	66.7	29	96.7	45	83.3	1	5.9	2	6.1	3	6.0
	N	1	4.2	1	3.3	2	3.7	10	58.8	24	72.7	34	68.0
	NO	7	29.2	0	0	7	13.0	6	35.3	7	21.2	13	26.0
A2	Y	9	37.5	22	73.3	31	57.4	4	23.5	6	18.2	10	20.0
	N	3	12.5	1	3.3	4	7.4	10	58.8	14	42.4	24	48.0
	NO	12	50.0	7	23.3	19	35.2	3	17.6	13	39.4	16	32.0
A3	Y	20	83.3	29	96.7	49	90.7	9	52.9	22	66.7	31	62.0
	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	17.6	2	6.1	5	10.0
	NO	4	16.7	1	3.3	5	9.3	5	29.4	9	27.3	14	28.0
A4	Y	15	62.5	27	90.0	42	77.8	3	17.6	8	24.2	11	22.0
	N	2	8.3	1	3.3	3	5.6	9	52.9	21	63.6	30	60.0
	NO	7	29.2	2	6.7	9	16.7	5	29.4	4	12.1	9	18.0
A5	Y	19	79.2	24	80.0	43	79.6	5	29.4	9	27.3	14	28.0
	N	2	8.3	2	6.7	4	7.4	9	52.9	16	48.5	25	50.0
	NO	3	12.5	4	13.3	7	13.0	3	17.6	8	24.2	11	22.0
A6	Y	13	54.2	20	66.7	33	61.1	3	17.6	2	6.1	5	10.0
	N	5	20.8	2	6.7	7	13.0	9	52.9	20	60.6	29	58.0
	NO	6	25.0	8	26.7	14	26.0	5	29.4	11	33.3	16	32.0
A7	Y	13	54.2	15	50.0	28	51.9	2	11.8	9	27.3	11	22.0
	N	3	12.5	1	3.3	4	7.4	8	47.1	7	21.2	15	30.0
	NO	8	33.3	14	46.7	22	40.7	7	41.2	17	51.5	24	48.0
A8	Y	14	58.3	25	83.3	39	72.2	5	29.4	13	39.4	18	36.0
	N	4	16.7	4	13.3	8	14.8	5	29.4	17	51.5	22	44.0
	NO	6	25.0	1	3.3	7	13.0	7	41.2	3	9.1	10	20.0
A9	Y	19	79.2	26	86.7	45	83.3	7	41.2	30	90.9	37	74.0
	N	2	8.3	0	0	2	3.7	5	29.4	2	6.1	7	14.0
	NO	3	12.5	4	13.3	7	13.0	5	29.4	1	3.0	6	12.0
A10	Y	12	50.0	28	93.3	40	74.1	1	5.9	6	18.2	7	14.0
	N	1	4.2	1	3.3	2	3.7	8	47.1	17	51.5	25	50.0
	NO	11	45.8	1	3.3	12	22.2	8	47.1	10	30.3	18	36.0

TABLE VIII (Continued)

ITEM	OPIN	Community AI Ad - 24 f	%	St - 30 f	%	T - 54 f	%	Community AII Ad - 17 f	%	St - 33 f	%	T - 50 f	%
	Y	14	58.3	23	76.7	37	68.5	2	11.8	2	6.1	4	8.0
All	N	2	8.3	2	6.7	4	7.4	8	47.1	24	72.7	32	64.0
	NO	8	33.3	5	16.7	13	24.1	7	41.2	7	21.2	14	28.0
	Y	8	33.3	8	26.7	16	29.6	6	35.3	12	36.4	18	36.0
B1	N	6	25.0	17	56.7	23	42.6	4	23.5	16	48.5	20	40.0
	NO	10	41.7	5	16.7	15	27.8	7	41.2	5	15.2	12	24.0
	Y	1	4.2	2	6.7	3	5.6	9	52.9	16	48.5	25	50.0
B2	N	10	41.7	20	66.7	30	55.6	4	23.5	12	36.4	16	32.0
	NO	13	54.2	8	26.7	21	38.9	4	23.5	5	15.2	9	18.0
	Y	9	37.5	16	53.3	25	46.3	7	41.2	15	45.5	22	44.0
B3	N	6	25.0	8	26.7	14	25.9	7	41.2	8	24.2	15	30.0
	NO	9	37.5	6	20.0	15	27.8	3	17.6	10	30.3	13	26.0
	Y	13	54.2	17	56.7	30	55.6	10	58.8	28	84.8	38	76.0
C1	N	3	12.5	4	13.3	7	13.7	1	5.9	4	12.1	5	10.0
	NO	8	33.3	9	30.0	17	31.5	6	35.3	1	3.0	7	14.0
	Y	6	25.0	21	70.0	27	50.0	5	29.4	29	87.9	34	68.0
C2	N	3	12.5	5	16.7	8	14.8	5	29.4	2	6.1	7	14.0
	NO	15	62.5	4	13.3	19	35.2	7	41.2	2	6.1	9	18.0
	Y	12	50.0	17	56.7	29	53.7	11	64.7	22	66.7	33	66.0
C3	N	2	8.3	8	26.7	10	18.5	2	11.8	5	15.2	7	14.0
	NO	10	41.7	5	16.7	15	27.8	4	23.5	6	18.2	10	20.0
	Y	17	70.8	19	63.3	36	66.7	11	64.7	24	72.7	35	70.0
C4	N	1	4.2	2	6.7	3	5.6	4	23.5	5	15.2	9	18.0
	NO	6	25.0	9	30.0	15	27.8	2	11.8	4	12.1	6	12.0
	Y	12	50.0	19	63.3	31	57.4	16	94.1	24	72.7	40	80.0
C5	N	3	12.5	7	23.3	10	18.5	0	0	4	12.1	4	8.0
	NO	9	37.5	4	13.3	13	24.1	1	5.9	5	15.2	6	12.0

TABLE VIII (Continued)

ITEM	OPIN	Community AI Ad - 24 f	%	St - 30 f	%	T - 54 f	%	Community AII Ad - 17 f	%	St - 33 f	%	T - 50 f	%
	Y	15	62.5	27	90.0	42	77.8	2	11.8	2	6.1	4	8.0
D1	N	1	4.2	2	6.7	3	5.6	9	52.9	23	69.7	32	64.0
	NO	8	33.3	1	3.3	9	16.7	6	35.3	8	24.2	14	28.0
	Y	7	29.2	25	83.3	32	59.3	2	11.8	1	3.0	3	6.0
D2	N	2	8.3	1	3.3	3	5.6	11	64.7	28	84.8	39	78.0
	NO	15	62.5	4	13.3	19	35.2	4	23.5	4	12.1	8	16.0
	Y	12	50.0	24	80.0	36	66.7	4	23.5	8	24.2	12	24.0
D3	N	3	12.5	3	10.0	6	11.1	10	58.8	21	63.6	31	62.0
	NO	9	37.5	3	10.0	12	22.2	3	17.6	4	12.1	7	14.0
	Y	17	70.8	27	90.0	44	81.5	5	29.4	21	63.6	26	52.0
D4	N	2	8.3	2	6.7	4	7.4	8	47.1	5	15.2	13	26.0
	NO	5	20.8	1	3.3	6	11.1	4	23.5	7	21.2	11	22.0
	Y	13	54.2	25	83.3	38	70.4	6	35.3	13	39.4	19	38.0
D5	N	3	12.5	2	6.7	5	9.3	6	35.3	10	30.3	16	32.0
	NO	8	33.3	3	10.0	11	20.4	5	29.4	10	30.3	15	30.0
	Y	9	37.5	23	76.7	32	59.3	6	35.3	26	78.8	32	64.0
D6	N	2	8.3	3	10.0	5	9.3	5	29.4	3	9.1	8	16.0
	NO	13	54.2	4	13.3	17	31.5	6	35.3	4	12.1	10	20.0
	Y	13	54.2	26	86.7	39	72.2	2	11.8	5	15.2	7	14.0
D7	N	2	8.3	1	3.3	3	5.6	9	52.9	20	60.6	29	58.0
	NO	9	37.5	3	10.0	12	22.2	6	35.3	8	24.2	14	28.0
	Y	14	58.3	27	90.0	41	75.9	3	17.6	4	12.1	7	14.0
D8	N	1	4.2	1	3.3	2	3.7	8	47.1	17	51.5	25	50.0
	NO	9	37.5	2	6.7	11	20.4	6	35.3	12	36.4	18	36.0
	Y	1	4.2	3	10.0	4	7.4	9	52.9	20	60.6	29	58.0
E1	N	10	41.7	26	86.7	36	66.7	2	11.8	8	24.2	10	20.0
	NO	13	54.2	1	3.3	14	25.9	6	35.3	5	15.2	11	22.0
	Y	2	8.3	3	10.0	5	9.3	1	5.9	0	0	1	2.0
E2	N	5	20.8	24	80.0	29	53.7	9	52.9	28	84.8	37	74.0
	NO	17	70.8	3	10.0	20	37.0	7	41.2	5	15.2	12	24.0
	Y	4	16.7	5	16.7	9	16.7	2	11.8	5	15.2	7	14.0
E3	N	5	20.8	22	73.3	27	50.0	10	58.8	22	66.7	32	64.0
	NO	15	62.5	3	10.0	18	33.3	5	29.4	6	18.2	11	22.0

TABLE VIII (Continued)

ITEM	OPIN	Community BI Ad - 30 f	%	St - 74 f	%	T - 104 f	%	Community BII Ad - 35 f	%	St - 124 f	%	T - 159 f	%
	Y	25	83.3	41	55.4	66	63.5	34	97.1	114	91.9	148	93.1
A1	N	0	0	12	16.2	12	11.5	1	2.9	2	1.6	3	1.9
	NO	5	16.7	21	28.4	26	25.0	0	0	8	6.5	8	5.0
	Y	22	73.3	28	37.8	50	48.1	29	82.9	69	55.6	98	61.6
A2	N	2	6.7	7	9.5	9	8.7	0	0	6	4.8	6	3.8
	NO	6	20.0	39	52.7	45	43.3	6	17.1	49	39.5	55	34.6
	Y	25	83.3	49	66.2	74	71.2	32	91.4	96	77.4	128	80.5
A3	N	0	0	6	8.1	6	5.8	0	0	2	1.6	2	1.3
	NO	5	16.7	19	25.7	24	23.1	3	8.6	26	21.0	29	18.2
	Y	25	83.3	49	66.2	74	71.2	31	88.6	103	83.1	134	84.3
A4	N	1	3.3	9	12.2	10	9.6	0	0	5	4.0	5	3.1
	NO	4	13.3	16	21.6	20	19.2	4	11.4	16	12.9	20	12.6
	Y	26	86.7	46	62.2	72	69.2	34	97.1	112	90.3	146	91.8
A5	N	0	0	8	10.8	8	7.7	0	0	7	5.6	7	4.4
	NO	4	13.3	20	27.0	24	23.1	1	2.9	5	4.0	6	3.8
	Y	27	90.0	56	75.7	83	79.8	34	97.1	103	83.1	137	86.2
A6	N	1	3.3	3	4.1	4	3.8	0	0	3	2.4	3	1.9
	NO	2	6.7	15	20.3	17	16.3	1	2.9	18	14.5	19	11.9
	Y	21	70.0	24	32.4	45	43.3	28	80.0	46	37.1	74	46.5
A7	N	1	3.3	12	16.2	13	12.5	1	2.9	8	6.5	9	5.7
	NO	8	26.7	38	51.4	46	44.2	6	17.1	70	56.5	76	47.8
	Y	23	76.7	31	41.9	54	51.9	29	82.9	102	82.3	131	82.4
A8	N	2	6.7	22	29.7	24	23.1	2	5.7	14	11.3	16	10.1
	NO	5	16.7	21	28.4	26	25.0	4	11.4	8	6.5	12	5.7
	Y	24	80.0	52	70.3	76	73.1	24	68.6	103	83.1	127	79.9
A9	N	2	6.7	9	12.2	11	10.6	2	5.7	15	12.1	17	10.7
	NO	4	13.3	13	17.6	17	16.3	9	25.7	6	4.8	15	9.4
	Y	20	66.7	25	33.8	45	43.3	26	74.3	95	76.6	121	76.1
A10	N	3	10.0	11	14.9	14	13.5	2	5.7	6	4.8	8	5.0
	NO	7	23.3	38	51.4	45	43.3	7	20.0	23	18.5	30	18.9

TABLE VIII (Continued)

ITEM	OPIN	Community BI Ad - 30 f	%	St - 74 f	%	T - 104 f	%	Community BII Ad - 35 f	%	St - 124 f	%	T - 159 f	%
	Y	27	90.0	57	77.0	84	80.8	32	91.4	102	82.3	134	84.3
All	N	1	3.3	3	4.1	4	3.8	1	2.9	7	5.6	8	5.0
	NO	2	6.7	14	18.9	16	15.4	2	5.7	15	12.1	17	10.7
	Y	4	13.3	14	18.9	18	17.3	5	14.3	32	25.8	37	23.3
B1	N	12	40.0	28	37.8	40	38.5	16	45.7	71	57.3	87	54.7
	NO	14	46.7	32	43.2	46	44.2	14	40.0	21	16.9	35	22.0
	Y	3	10.0	14	18.9	17	16.3	0	0	11	8.9	11	6.9
B2	N	22	73.3	35	47.3	57	54.8	31	88.6	105	84.7	136	85.5
	NO	5	16.7	25	33.8	30	28.8	4	11.4	8	6.5	12	7.5
	Y	14	46.7	33	44.6	47	45.2	11	31.4	26	21.0	37	23.3
B3	N	6	20.0	13	17.6	19	18.3	14	40.0	76	61.3	90	56.6
	NO	10	33.3	28	37.8	38	36.5	10	28.6	22	17.7	32	20.1
	Y	16	53.3	37	50.0	53	51.0	12	34.3	75	60.5	87	54.7
C1	N	4	13.3	8	10.8	12	11.5	7	20.0	27	21.8	34	21.4
	NO	10	33.3	29	39.2	39	37.5	16	45.7	22	17.7	38	23.9
	Y	13	43.3	51	68.9	64	61.5	9	25.7	93	75.0	102	64.2
C2	N	5	16.7	6	8.1	11	10.6	10	28.6	23	18.5	33	20.8
	NO	12	40.0	17	23.0	29	27.9	16	45.7	8	6.5	24	15.1
	Y	15	50.0	30	40.5	45	43.3	15	42.9	69	55.6	84	52.8
C3	N	3	10.0	8	10.8	11	10.6	8	22.9	27	21.8	35	22.0
	NO	12	40.0	36	48.6	48	46.2	12	34.3	28	22.6	40	25.2
	Y	20	66.7	44	59.5	64	61.5	14	40.0	44	35.5	58	36.5
C4	N	1	3.3	5	6.8	6	5.8	9	25.7	43	34.7	52	32.7
	NO	9	30.0	25	33.8	34	32.7	12	34.3	37	29.8	49	30.8
	Y	17	56.7	36	48.6	53	51.0	16	45.7	85	68.5	101	63.5
C5	N	3	10.0	7	9.5	10	9.6	7	20.0	13	10.5	20	12.6
	NO	10	33.3	31	41.9	41	39.4	12	34.3	26	21.0	38	23.9

TABLE VIII (Continued)

ITEM	OPIN	Community BI Ad - 30 f	%	St - 74 f	%	T - 104 f	%	Community BII Ad - 35 f	%	St - 124 f	%	T - 159 f	%
	Y	21	70.0	41	55.4	62	59.6	31	88.6	107	86.3	138	86.8
D1	N	1	3.3	8	10.8	9	8.7	1	2.9	6	4.8	7	4.4
	NO	8	26.7	25	33.8	33	31.7	3	8.6	11	8.9	14	8.8
	Y	12	40.0	28	37.8	40	38.5	27	77.1	75	60.5	102	64.2
D2	N	4	13.3	13	17.6	17	16.3	2	5.7	19	15.3	21	13.2
	NO	14	46.7	33	44.6	47	45.2	6	17.1	30	24.2	36	22.6
	Y	20	66.7	28	37.8	48	46.2	28	80.0	84	67.7	112	70.4
D3	N	4	13.3	15	20.3	19	18.3	2	5.7	15	12.1	17	10.7
	NO	6	20.0	31	41.9	37	35.6	5	14.3	25	20.2	30	18.9
	Y	20	66.7	41	55.4	61	58.7	31	88.6	106	85.5	137	86.2
D4	N	1	3.3	15	20.3	16	15.4	1	2.9	9	7.3	10	6.3
	NO	9	30.0	18	24.3	27	26.0	3	8.6	9	7.3	12	7.5
	Y	22	73.3	42	56.8	64	61.5	28	80.0	93	75.0	121	76.1
D5	N	2	6.7	12	16.2	14	13.5	2	5.7	10	8.1	12	7.5
	NO	6	20.0	20	27.0	26	25.0	5	14.3	21	16.9	26	16.4
	Y	15	50.0	20	27.0	35	33.7	27	77.1	52	41.9	79	49.7
D6	N	2	6.7	17	23.0	19	18.3	1	2.9	31	25.0	32	20.1
	NO	13	43.3	37	50.0	50	48.1	7	20.0	41	33.1	48	30.2
	Y	16	53.3	34	45.9	50	48.1	25	71.4	96	77.4	121	76.1
D7	N	2	6.7	12	16.2	14	13.5	2	5.7	6	4.8	8	5.0
	NO	12	40.0	28	37.8	40	38.5	8	22.9	22	17.7	30	18.9
	Y	24	80.0	46	62.2	70	67.3	30	85.7	101	81.5	131	82.4
D8	N	1	3.3	3	4.1	4	3.8	2	5.7	4	3.2	6	3.8
	NO	5	16.7	25	33.8	30	28.8	3	8.6	19	15.3	22	13.8
	Y	4	13.3	10	13.5	14	13.5	4	11.4	6	4.8	10	6.3
E1	N	11	36.7	35	47.3	46	44.2	20	57.1	97	78.2	117	73.6
	NO	15	50.0	29	39.2	44	42.3	11	31.4	21	16.9	32	20.1
	Y	3	10.0	18	24.3	21	20.2	1	2.9	16	12.9	17	10.7
E2	N	14	46.7	30	40.5	44	42.3	24	68.6	93	75.0	117	73.6
	NO	13	43.3	26	35.1	39	37.5	10	28.6	15	12.1	25	15.7
	Y	3	10.0	23	31.1	26	25.0	3	8.6	35	28.2	38	23.9
E3	N	14	46.7	26	35.1	40	38.5	22	62.9	59	47.6	81	50.9
	NO	13	43.3	25	33.8	38	36.5	10	28.6	30	24.2	40	25.2

TABLE VIII (Continued)

ITEM	OPIN	Community CI Ad - 24 f	%	St - 123 f	%	T - 147 f	%	Community CII Ad - 62 f	%	St - 98 f	%	T - 160 f	%
	Y	16	66.7	62	50.4	78	53.1	55	88.7	90	91.8	145	90.6
A1	N	5	20.8	24	19.5	29	19.7	2	3.2	3	3.1	5	3.1
	NO	3	12.5	37	30.1	40	27.2	5	8.1	5	5.1	10	6.3
	Y	11	45.8	42	34.1	53	36.1	46	74.2	54	55.1	100	62.5
A2	N	3	12.5	12	9.8	15	10.2	1	1.6	8	8.2	9	5.6
	NO	10	41.7	69	56.1	79	53.7	15	24.2	36	36.7	51	31.9
	Y	17	70.8	88	71.5	105	71.4	58	93.5	76	77.6	134	83.8
A3	N	0	0	4	3.3	4	2.7	1	1.6	3	3.1	4	2.5
	NO	7	29.2	31	25.2	38	25.9	3	4.8	19	19.4	22	13.8
	Y	17	70.8	68	55.3	85	57.8	56	90.3	81	82.7	137	85.6
A4	N	3	12.5	23	18.7	26	17.7	1	1.6	5	5.1	6	3.8
	NO	4	16.7	32	26.0	36	24.5	5	8.1	12	12.2	17	10.6
	Y	19	79.2	77	62.6	96	65.3	59	95.2	84	85.7	143	89.4
A5	N	1	4.2	23	18.7	24	16.3	2	3.2	4	4.1	6	3.8
	NO	4	16.7	23	18.7	27	18.4	1	1.6	10	10.2	11	6.9
	Y	15	62.5	68	55.3	83	56.5	58	93.5	85	86.7	143	89.4
A6	N	2	8.3	18	14.6	20	13.6	1	1.6	3	3.1	4	2.5
	NO	7	29.2	37	30.1	44	29.9	3	4.8	10	10.2	13	8.1
	Y	13	54.2	44	35.8	57	38.8	41	66.1	47	48.0	88	55.0
A7	N	2	8.3	16	13.0	18	12.2	4	6.5	7	7.1	11	6.9
	NO	9	37.5	63	51.2	72	49.0	17	27.4	44	45.0	61	38.1
	Y	11	45.8	75	61.0	86	58.5	54	87.1	81	82.7	135	84.4
A8	N	5	20.8	26	21.1	31	21.1	2	3.2	4	4.1	6	3.8
	NO	8	33.3	22	17.9	30	20.4	6	9.7	13	13.3	19	11.9
	Y	17	70.8	91	74.0	108	73.5	47	75.8	82	83.7	129	80.6
A9	N	2	8.3	18	14.6	20	13.6	3	4.8	5	5.1	8	5.0
	NO	5	20.8	14	11.4	19	12.9	12	19.4	11	11.2	23	14.4
	Y	10	41.7	41	33.3	51	34.7	45	72.6	69	70.4	114	71.3
A10	N	6	25.0	27	22.0	33	22.4	4	6.5	5	5.1	9	5.6
	NO	8	33.3	55	44.7	63	42.9	13	21.0	24	24.5	37	23.1

TABLE VIII (Continued)

ITEM	OPIN	Community CI Ad - 24 f	%	St - 123 f	%	T - 147 f	%	Community CII Ad - 62 f	%	St - 98 f	%	T - 160 f	%
	Y	15	62.5	86	69.9	101	68.7	60	96.8	97	99.0	157	98.1
All	N	3	12.5	13	10.6	16	10.9	0	0	1	1.0	1	0.6
	NO	6	25.0	24	19.5	30	20.4	2	3.2	0	0	2	1.3
	Y	2	8.3	24	19.5	26	17.7	10	16.1	19	19.4	29	18.1
B1	N	10	41.7	67	54.5	77	52.4	28	45.2	65	66.3	93	58.1
	NO	12	50.0	32	26.0	44	29.9	24	38.7	14	14.3	38	23.8
	Y	2	8.3	23	18.7	25	17.0	5	8.1	6	6.1	11	6.9
B2	N	14	58.3	76	61.8	90	61.2	46	74.2	84	85.7	130	81.3
	NO	8	33.3	24	19.5	32	21.8	11	17.7	8	8.2	19	11.9
	Y	7	29.2	50	40.7	57	38.8	7	11.3	12	12.2	19	11.9
B3	N	9	37.5	38	30.9	47	32.0	27	43.5	73	74.5	100	62.5
	NO	8	33.3	35	28.5	43	29.3	28	45.2	13	13.3	41	25.6
	Y	13	54.2	92	74.8	105	71.4	24	38.7	54	55.1	78	48.8
C1	N	2	8.3	12	9.8	14	9.5	18	29.0	19	19.4	37	23.1
	NO	9	37.5	19	15.4	28	19.0	20	32.3	25	25.5	45	28.1
	Y	11	45.8	92	74.8	103	70.1	15	24.2	63	64.3	78	48.8
C2	N	3	12.5	18	14.6	21	14.3	23	37.1	27	27.6	50	31.3
	NO	10	41.7	13	10.6	23	15.6	24	38.7	8	8.2	32	20.0
	Y	13	54.2	72	58.5	85	57.8	29	46.8	54	55.1	83	51.9
C3	N	3	12.5	25	20.3	28	19.0	11	17.7	18	18.4	29	18.1
	NO	8	33.3	26	21.1	34	23.1	22	35.5	26	26.5	48	30.0
	Y	13	54.2	77	62.6	90	61.2	18	29.0	38	38.8	56	35.0
C4	N	5	20.8	14	11.4	19	12.9	14	22.6	29	29.6	43	26.9
	NO	6	25.0	32	26.0	38	25.9	30	48.4	31	31.6	61	38.1
	Y	11	45.8	74	60.2	85	57.8	31	50.0	56	57.1	87	54.4
C5	N	3	12.5	19	15.4	22	15.0	8	12.9	22	22.4	30	18.8
	NO	10	41.7	30	24.4	40	27.2	23	37.1	20	20.4	43	26.9

TABLE VIII (Continued)

ITEM	OPIN	Community CI Ad - 24 f	%	St - 123 f	%	T - 147 f	%	Community CII Ad - 62 f	%	St - 98 f	%	T - 160 f	%
	Y	14	58.3	59	48.0	73	49.7	53	85.5	92	93.9	145	90.6
D1	N	4	16.7	26	21.1	30	20.4	2	3.2	3	3.1	5	3.1
	NO	6	25.0	38	30.9	44	29.9	7	11.3	3	3.1	10	6.3
	Y	7	29.2	34	27.6	41	27.9	46	74.2	60	61.2	106	66.3
D2	N	6	25.0	43	35.0	49	33.3	2	3.2	12	12.2	14	8.8
	NO	11	45.8	46	37.4	57	38.8	14	22.6	26	26.5	40	25.0
	Y	11	45.8	26	21.1	37	25.2	52	83.9	80	81.6	132	82.5
D3	N	8	33.3	47	38.2	55	37.4	2	3.2	5	5.1	7	4.4
	NO	5	20.8	50	40.7	55	37.4	8	12.9	13	13.3	21	13.1
	Y	15	62.5	68	55.3	83	56.5	55	88.7	89	90.8	144	90.0
D4	N	7	29.2	28	22.8	35	23.8	2	3.2	4	4.1	6	3.8
	NO	2	8.3	27	22.0	29	19.7	5	8.1	5	5.1	10	6.3
	Y	13	54.2	64	52.0	77	52.4	53	85.5	76	77.6	129	80.6
D5	N	4	16.7	24	19.5	28	19.0	2	3.2	7	7.1	9	5.6
	NO	7	29.2	35	28.5	42	28.6	7	11.3	15	15.3	22	13.8
	Y	9	37.5	38	30.9	47	32.0	45	72.6	68	69.4	113	70.6
D6	N	8	33.3	37	30.1	45	30.6	0	0	6	6.1	6	3.8
	NO	7	29.2	48	39.0	55	37.4	17	27.4	24	24.5	41	25.6
	Y	9	37.5	44	35.8	53	36.1	42	67.7	64	65.3	106	66.3
D7	N	7	29.2	22	17.9	29	19.7	4	6.5	5	5.1	9	5.6
	NO	8	33.3	57	46.3	65	44.2	16	25.8	29	29.6	45	28.1
	Y	16	66.7	64	52.0	80	54.4	56	90.3	89	90.8	145	90.6
D8	N	1	4.2	15	12.2	16	10.9	2	3.2	3	3.1	5	3.1
	NO	7	29.2	44	35.8	51	34.7	4	6.5	6	6.1	10	6.3
	Y	6	25.0	23	18.7	29	19.7	6	9.7	9	9.2	15	9.4
E1	N	8	33.3	58	47.2	66	44.9	36	58.1	70	71.4	106	66.3
	NO	10	41.7	42	34.1	52	35.4	20	32.3	19	19.4	39	24.4
	Y	5	20.8	23	18.7	28	19.0	0	0	6	6.1	6	3.8
E2	N	10	41.7	57	46.3	67	45.6	42	67.7	76	77.6	118	73.8
	NO	9	37.5	43	35.0	52	35.4	20	32.3	16	16.3	36	22.5
	Y	5	20.8	32	26.0	37	25.2	2	3.2	5	5.1	7	4.4
E3	N	11	45.8	49	39.8	60	40.8	39	62.9	76	77.6	115	71.9
	NO	8	33.3	42	34.1	50	34.0	21	33.9	17	17.3	38	23.8

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Item	Opinions	Totals I N = 305 f	%	II N = 369 f	%	I & II N = 674 f	%
A1	Yes	189	62.0	296	80.2	485	72.0
	No	43	14.1	42	11.4	85	12.6
	No O.	73	23.9	31	8.4	104	15.4
A2	Yes	134	43.9	208	56.4	342	50.7
	No	28	9.2	39	10.6	67	9.9
	No O.	143	46.9	122	33.1	265	39.3
A3	Yes	228	74.8	293	79.4	521	77.3
	No	10	3.3	11	3.0	21	3.1
	No O.	67	22.0	65	17.6	132	19.6
A4	Yes	201	65.9	282	76.4	483	71.7
	No	39	12.8	41	11.1	80	11.9
	No O.	65	21.3	46	12.5	111	16.5
A5	Yes	211	69.2	303	82.1	514	76.3
	No	36	11.8	38	10.3	74	11.0
	No O.	58	19.0	28	7.6	86	12.8
A6	Yes	199	65.2	285	77.2	484	71.8
	No	31	10.2	36	9.8	67	9.9
	No O.	75	24.6	48	13.0	123	18.2
A7	Yes	130	42.6	173	46.9	303	45.0
	No	35	11.5	35	9.5	70	10.4
	No O.	140	45.9	161	43.6	301	44.7
A8	Yes	179	58.7	284	77.0	463	68.7
	No	63	20.7	44	11.9	107	15.9
	No O.	63	20.7	41	11.1	104	15.4
A9	Yes	229	75.1	293	79.4	522	77.4
	No	33	10.8	32	8.7	65	9.6
	No O.	43	14.1	44	11.9	87	12.9
A10	Yes	136	44.6	242	65.6	378	56.1
	No	49	16.1	42	11.4	91	13.5
	No O.	120	39.3	85	23.0	205	30.4

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Item	Opinions	Totals I N = 305 f	%	II N = 369 f	%	I & II N = 674 f	%
All	Yes	222	72.8	295	79.9	517	76.7
	No	24	7.9	41	11.1	65	9.6
	No O.	59	19.3	33	8.9	92	13.6
B1	Yes	60	19.7	84	22.8	144	21.4
	No	140	45.9	200	54.2	340	50.4
	No O.	105	34.4	85	23.0	190	28.2
B2	Yes	45	14.8	47	12.7	92	13.6
	No	177	58.0	282	76.4	459	68.1
	No O.	83	27.2	40	10.8	123	18.2
B3	Yes	124	42.3	78	21.1	207	30.7
	No	80	26.2	205	55.6	285	42.3
	No O.	96	31.5	86	23.3	182	27.0
C1	Yes	188	61.6	203	55.0	391	58.0
	No	33	10.8	76	20.6	109	16.2
	No O.	84	27.5	90	24.4	174	25.8
C2	Yes	194	63.6	214	58.0	408	60.5
	No	40	13.1	90	24.4	130	19.3
	No O.	71	23.3	65	17.6	136	20.2
C3	Yes	159	52.1	200	54.2	359	53.3
	No	49	16.1	71	19.2	120	17.8
	No O.	97	31.8	98	26.6	195	28.9
C4	Yes	190	62.3	149	40.4	339	50.3
	No	28	9.2	104	28.2	132	19.6
	No O.	87	28.5	116	31.4	203	30.1
C5	Yes	169	55.4	228	61.8	397	58.9
	No	42	13.8	54	14.6	96	14.2
	No O.	94	30.8	87	23.6	181	26.9

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Item	Opinions	Totals I N = 305 f	%	II N = 369 f	%	I & II N = 674 f	%
D1	Yes	177	58.0	287	77.8	464	68.8
	No	42	13.8	44	11.9	86	12.8
	No O.	86	28.2	38	10.3	124	18.4
D2	Yes	113	37.0	211	57.2	324	48.1
	No	69	22.6	74	20.1	143	21.2
	No O.	123	40.3	84	22.8	207	30.7
D3	Yes	121	39.7	256	69.4	377	55.9
	No	80	26.2	55	14.9	135	20.0
	No O.	104	34.1	58	15.7	162	24.0
D4	Yes	188	61.6	307	83.2	495	73.4
	No	55	18.0	29	7.9	84	12.5
	No O.	62	20.3	33	8.9	95	14.1
D5	Yes	179	58.7	269	72.9	448	66.5
	No	47	15.4	37	10.0	84	12.5
	No O.	79	25.9	63	17.1	142	21.1
D6	Yes	114	37.4	224	60.7	338	50.1
	No	69	22.6	46	12.5	115	17.1
	No O.	122	40.0	99	26.8	221	32.8
D7	Yes	142	46.6	234	63.4	376	55.8
	No	46	15.1	46	12.5	92	13.6
	No O.	117	38.4	89	24.1	206	30.6
D8	Yes	191	62.6	283	76.7	474	70.3
	No	22	7.2	36	9.8	58	8.6
	No O.	92	30.2	50	13.6	142	21.1
E1	Yes	47	15.4	54	14.6	101	15.0
	No	148	48.5	233	63.1	381	56.5
	No O.	110	36.1	82	22.2	192	28.5
E2	Yes	54	17.7	24	6.5	78	11.6
	No	140	45.9	272	73.7	412	61.1
	No O.	111	36.4	73	19.8	184	27.3
E3	Yes	72	23.6	52	14.1	124	18.4
	No	127	41.6	228	61.8	355	52.7
	No O.	106	34.8	89	24.1	195	28.9

Summary

Unstructured opinions about the music education program in three representative communities were elicited from a representative sample of the population of those communities. The thirty unstructured opinions which were common to all three communities were used in an instrument designed to measure the strengths of those opinions in a representative sample of the population of the three communities from which the unstructured opinions were derived, and in a representative sample of three equated communities.

The data reported in this chapter consisted of a list of common unstructured opinions (TABLE V), a tabulation of ranks assigned to each opinion according to frequency of mention in the first survey (TABLE VI), a tabulation of ranks assigned to each opinion according to frequency of selection in the second survey (TABLE VII), and a summary of the responses to each item of the instrument designed to measure the strengths of commonly held opinions in the six representative communities surveyed (TABLE VIII).

CHAPTER IV

NATURE AND VALIDITY OF SAMPLING DATA

The data tabulated in Chapter III were derived from opinion surveys conducted in six communities assumed to be representative or typical of the total area chosen for study. The communities were selected by agreement of a jury of qualified experts. The six communities were divided into three categories based on high school enrollment in the community.

TABLE IX

REPRESENTATIVE COMMUNITIES CHOSEN BY JURY

Community	H. S. Enrollment	
	Number	% of Total
AI	74	6.0
AII	73	5.9
BI	159	12.9
BII	297	24.0
CI	331	26.8
CII	301	24.4
Total	1235	100.0

Analysis of Samples for Representativeness

Samples of the student and adult population were drawn at random for both surveys. In the case of small random samples the validity of the data is contingent partially on the representativeness of the sample. The samples were subjected to analysis to determine the representativeness of the samples

from which the data of the study were derived. The method of selecting the sample was designed to furnish samples within communities which would be proportional to the adult-student population of the community, and in which the adult sample would be representative of occupational categories chosen for stratification. Between communities the samples were to be proportional to the populations sampled. The total sample was to be representative of adult-student population, and the adult portion of the sample was to be representative of occupational categories in the same ratio as that in which the various occupations existed in the total population sampled.

For purposes of stratification of sample, occupational categories were selected as they are reported by the United States Census Bureau. TABLE X provides a list of code numbers for the occupational categories used.

TABLE X

OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS
USED FOR STRATIFICATION OF SAMPLES

Code	Classification
000	Professional, technical, and kindred workers
100	Farmers and farm managers
200	Managers, officials, proprietors, except farm
300	Clerical and kindred workers
400	Sales workers
500	Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers
600	Operatives and kindred workers
700 - 720	Private household workers
730	Service workers, except private household
800	Farm laborers and foremen
900	Laborers, except farm and mine
VVV	Occupation not reported

TABLE XI is a report of distribution of returns from both surveys. Adult returns are categorized by occupation.

TABLE XI

RETURNS CLASSIFIED BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	First Survey			
Code	AI	BI	CI	Total
000	4	3	20	27
100	10	10	12	32
200	1	7	11	19
300	2	2	6	10
400	1	4	7	12
500	0	6	17	23
600	1	1	2	4
700 - 720	0	0	1	1
730	0	0	5	5
800	0	0	0	0
900	2	6	7	15
VVV	0	5	4	9
Total Adults	21	44	92	157
Ballots Mailed	139	364	612	1115
%, Adult Returns	15.1	12.1	15.0	14.1
Total Students	11	26	47	84
H. S. Enrollment	74	159	331	564
%, Student Returns	14.9	16.4	14.2	14.9
Total, Adults and Students	32	70	139	241

TABLE XI (Continued)

Code	Second Survey AI	BI	CI	AII	BII	CII	Total
000	2	2	4	4	5	10	27
100	13	6	2	13	3	5	42
200	2	5	3	0	7	13	30
300	0	3	2	0	0	5	10
400	1	2	3	0	5	9	20
500	2	4	3	0	7	4	20
600	0	2	0	0	2	6	10
700 - 720	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
730	0	1	1	0	1	3	6
800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
900	2	3	3	0	2	1	11
VVV	3	2	3	0	2	5	15
Total Adults	25	30	24	17	35	62	193
Ballots Mailed	70	182	305	255	309	222	1343
%, Adult Returns	35.3	16.5	7.9	6.7	11.3	27.9	14.4
Total Students	30	74	123	33	124	98	482
H. S. Enrollment	74	159	331	73	297	301	1235
%, Student Returns	40.5	46.5	37.2	45.2	41.8	32.6	39.1
Total, Adults and Students	55	104	147	50	159	160	675

In the first sample, adult returns represented 14.1% of the ballots mailed. Ballots were mailed to one-third of the population selected at random. The student returns represented 14.9% of the total high school enrollment of the three communities surveyed. Thus, the total sample in the first survey was weighted in favor of student representation over adult representation by approximately three to one. Balance could have been restored to the sample by further random cast-out of student returns but this was rejected because of the relatively low adult response. Since the first survey was designed to elicit original opinions there would have been no assurance that significant opinions had not been lost in reducing the number of student respondents to secure a statistically representative sample.

Approximately the same proportions held for each community sampled in the first survey as was evident in the total sample above. It can be said that the sample drawn for the first survey was reasonably representative of the sizes of communities involved.

In the second sample, adult returns represented 14.4% of the ballots mailed. Ballots were mailed to one-sixth of the adult population selected at random. The student returns represented 39.1% of the high school enrollment. Thus, the total sample in the second survey was weighted in favor of student representation over adult representation by approximately twelve to one. Again, the disproportionate student

response was retained because of the relatively low number of adult returns.

The adult returns were not proportional to size of community in the second sample, varying from a return of 6.7% for community AII to 35.3% for community AI. The student returns were reasonably proportional to high school enrollments in the six communities surveyed.

Analysis of Samples for Occupational Representativeness

The principal bias occurring in random sampling by mail ballot is often a so-called "upper-level" bias caused by a disproportionately high return from occupational categories representing upper income levels. As a further test of representativeness of sample the returns from both surveys were categorized by occupations then compared with a distribution assumed to be typical of the area of the study. TABLE XII shows the distribution of the population by occupational categories in the six counties in which the six communities studied were located. The information was extracted from the 1940 national census report, the latest figures available at the time the study was done.

TABLE XII

DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION OF SIX COUNTIES FROM WHICH SAMPLES WERE DRAWN

Code	County AI		County BI		County CI	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
000	389	5.7	502	5.4	15,398	8.2
100	2521	37.1	2607	28.1	2,279	1.2
200	514	7.6	756	8.2	20,960	11.2
300 & 400	583	8.6	750	8.1	54,134	29.0
500	401	5.9	557	6.0	21,597	11.6
600	534	7.9	1625	17.5	30,436	16.3
700 - 720	194	2.9	295	3.2	8,693	4.7
730	241	3.5	428	4.6	20,869	11.2
800	1052	15.5	1164	12.6	1,662	0.9
900	287	4.2	550	5.9	9,638	5.2
VVV	83	1.2	40	0.4	1,127	0.6
Totals	6799		9274		186,793	

Code	County AII		County BII		County CII	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
000	581	5.8	503	8.7	336	5.5
100	2087	21.0	1849	32.2	2708	44.6
200	849	8.5	475	8.3	484	8.0
300 & 400	1513	15.2	500	8.7	455	7.5
500	1141	11.5	370	6.4	325	5.3
600	1413	14.2	385	6.7	417	6.9
700 - 720	439	4.4	243	4.2	144	2.4
730	590	5.9	281	4.9	212	3.5
800	721	7.2	784	13.6	677	11.1
900	524	5.3	303	5.3	241	4.0
VVV	91	0.9	57	1.0	76	1.3
Totals	9949		5750		6075	

Figures for Clerical Workers (300) and Sales Workers (400) were reported in the source as a combined Clerical and Sales category. This procedure was followed in treating the data of the study. In establishing a sample design from the census information, county CI in which community CI was located was rejected as atypical of the area of the study. The occupational distribution in that county would not be representative of the communities from which the sample was drawn.

In comparing the distribution of returns by occupational categories with the distribution of the population in those categories the significance of the difference between percentages was determined using the formula:

$$X = \frac{\frac{t_1}{n_1} - \frac{t_2}{n_2}}{\sqrt{p_0 q_0 \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

where t_1 is the number of individuals in a given occupational category according to census figures; t_2 is the number of adults responding in that category.

$$p_0 = \frac{t_1 + t_2}{n_1 + n_2} \quad ; \quad q_0 = 1 - p_0$$

The value of X when referred to the normal scale indicated the level at which the difference between the two percentages

was significant. It was necessary to combine categories 100 (Farmers and farm managers) and 800 (Farm laborers) since none of the returns indicated a distinction. It was assumed that farm owners, managers, and laborers indicated their occupation simply as Farmer on the returns.

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF ADULT SAMPLE BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, FIRST SURVEY, WITH OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION FOR FIVE COUNTIES

Code	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	X	Level of significance of difference
000	2311	27	.0589	.1824	6.35	.01
1-800	17832	32	.4542	.2162	18.40	.01
200	3078	19	.0784	.1284	2.26	.05
3-400	3801	22	.0968	.1486	2.13	.05
500	2893	23	.0737	.1554	3.79	.01
600	4374	4	.1114	.0270	3.26	.01
7-720	1315	1	.0335	.0018	1.80	-
730	1752	5	.0446	.0338	0.64	-
900	1905	15	.0485	.1014	2.99	.01
N	39261	148				

The results reported above indicated that the adult sample differed significantly from the population distribution in five occupational categories. The return was disproportionately high in categories 000 - Professional and technical, 500 - Craftsmen and foremen, and 900 - Laborers. The return was deficient in categories 1-800 - Farmer and farm labor, and 600 - Operatives (semi-skilled labor).

TABLE XIV reports the results of a comparison of the sample drawn in the second survey with the occupational

distribution for five counties. In this table, t_2 is the number of adult returns in each occupational category from the six communities surveyed.

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF ADULT SAMPLE BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, SECOND SURVEY, WITH OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION FOR FIVE COUNTIES

Code	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	X	Level of significance of difference
000	2311	27	.0589	.1517	5.23	.01
1-800	17832	42	.4542	.2360	5.84	.01
200	3078	30	.0784	.1685	4.36	.01
3-400	3801	30	.0968	.1685	3.17	.01
500	2893	20	.0737	.1123	1.96	.05
600	4374	10	.1114	.0562	2.34	.05
7-720	1315	2	.0335	.0112	1.65	-
730	1752	6	.0446	.0337	0.22	-
900	1905	11	.0485	.0618	0.82	-
N	39261	178				

The results reported in TABLE XIV indicated that the adult sample from the second survey was biased in favor of categories 000 - Professional and technical, 200 - Managers, officials, and proprietors, and 300-400 combined - Clerical and sales. It was deficient in returns from farmers and farm laborers.

The bias in both samples was the bias anticipated in random sampling by mail ballot. Originally it was intended that this bias could be corrected by random cast-out of ballots. Because of the low percentage of adult returns it was

felt that adequacy of sample would be sacrificed for statistical representativeness if this procedure were to be followed.

Analysis of Samples for Homogeneity of Response

Since the sample was partially representative it was possible to compare the responses of non-representative categories for homogeneity of response, then compare the responses of non-representative categories with those of categories known to be representative for significant differences. The rationale underlying this step was based on the logical assumption that if there was no significant difference between the responses of non-representative categories it indicated sufficient homogeneity of response to warrant the further assumption that the pattern of response was independent of the number of respondents in the non-representative categories. Then, if there was no significant difference between the responses of representative categories assumed to be valid on the basis of representativeness, and the responses of non-representative categories shown to be homogenous, it would indicate, in a measure, validity of response for the total sample.

The test for homogeneity of response among non-representative categories was based on the test for differences between percentages. The responses chosen to be tested were the most frequent responses to each item of the questionnaire used in the second survey. Four separate tests of significance were calculated in which each of the four non-

representative categories was contrasted with the other three.

Test I: 000 vs. 100 + 200 + 3-400
Test II: 100 vs. 000 + 200 + 3-400
Test III: 200 vs. 000 + 100 + 3-400
Test IV: 3-400 vs. 000 + 100 + 200

A summary of the tests for homogeneity of response is reported in TABLE XV. The results are reported by item, response tested, and level at which differences were significant.

The results of Test I indicated that there was no significant difference between the responses of Professional-Technical and the combination of Farmers, Managers-Officials-Proprietors, and Clerical-Sales. Test II indicated that Farmers differed significantly from the combination of the other three categories on the responses to four test items out of thirty. Test III showed a significant difference of response on two items for Managers-Officials compared with the residual combination. A significant difference of response was evident on only one test item when the Clerical-Sales category was compared with the other three (Test IV).

The above results were accepted as indicating that there was sufficient homogeneity of response among the non-representative categories to warrant the assumption that the response from individuals composing those categories would not be affected materially by an increase or decrease in the size of sample representing the categories in question. In other words, the tests of homogeneity provided a test of

TABLE XV

RESULTS OF TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF RESPONSE

Item	Response tested	Level of significance of difference			
		Test I	Test II	Test III	Test IV
A1	Yes	-	.01	.01	.05
A2	Yes	-	.05	.05	-
A3	Yes	-	-	-	-
A4	Yes	-	.01	-	-
A5	Yes	-	.01	.05	-
A6	Yes	-	.01	.05	.05
A7	Yes	-	-	-	-
A8	Yes	-	-	.01	-
A9	Yes	-	-	-	-
A10	Yes	-	-	-	-
A11	Yes	-	-	.05	.01
B1	No	-	-	-	-
B2	No	-	.05	.05	-
B3	No	-	-	-	-
C1	Yes	-	-	-	-
C2	Yes	-	-	-	-
C3	Yes	-	-	-	-
C4	Yes	-	-	-	-
C5	Yes	-	.05	-	-
D1	Yes	-	.05	-	-
D2	Yes	-	.05	-	-
D3	Yes	-	.05	-	-
D4	Yes	-	-	-	-
D5	Yes	-	.05	-	-
D6	Yes	-	-	-	-
D7	Yes	-	-	-	.05
D8	Yes	-	-	-	-
E1	No	-	-	-	-
E2	No	-	-	-	-
E3	No	-	-	-	-

representativeness of sample based on similarity of response.

Next, the responses from the numerically non-representative categories were compared with the responses from categories shown to be representative of the occupational distribution of the area. The same procedure was employed as above. Here the responses from categories 000, 100, 200, and 3-400 were pooled on the basis of homogeneity and compared with the responses from categories 500, 600, 700, 730, and 900 pooled on the basis of representativeness of sample.

TABLE XVI

RESULTS OF TESTS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF RESPONSE BETWEEN NON-REPRESENTATIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

Item	Response tested	Level of significant difference	Item	Response tested	Level of significant difference
A1	Yes	-	C2	Yes	-
A2	Yes	-	C3	Yes	-
A3	Yes	-	C4	Yes	-
A4	Yes	-	C5	Yes	-
A5	Yes	-	D1	Yes	.05
A6	Yes	-	D2	Yes	-
A7	Yes	.01	D3	Yes	-
A8	Yes	-	D4	Yes	.05
A9	Yes	-	D5	Yes	-
A10	Yes	-	D6	Yes	-
A11	Yes	.01	D7	Yes	-
B1	No	-	D8	Yes	.01
B2	No	-	E1	No	-
B3	No	.05	E2	No	-
C1	Yes	-	E3	No	-

The results reported in TABLE XVI indicated that there was a significant difference of response on three items out of thirty. This showed sufficient similarity to warrant the

assumption that the total sample of adults responding to the questionnaire used in the second survey was representative of the occupational categories used for stratification of sample.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument Designed to Secure Structured Opinions

The instrument used to secure the responses which were tested for homogeneity and representativeness was devised from unstructured opinions elicited in the first survey. The validity of the data of the second survey is partially dependent on the validity of that instrument. A measure of the validity of the instrument was secured by comparing the unstructured opinions secured in the first survey with the structured items of the test instrument, both ranked according to frequency of mention. TABLE VI, Chapter II, reported the ranks assigned to each item according to frequency of mention in the first survey. TABLE VII reported the ranks assigned to each item in the second survey. Correlation between ranks was determined by using the formula:

$$R = 1 - \frac{6 \leq d^2}{N^3 - N}$$

TABLE XVII is a report of correlations obtained from a comparison of item ranks on the total returns from communities AI, BI, and CI in the first survey, with item ranks on the total returns from the same communities in the second survey.

The items were ranked within groups and the correlations are reported for each group of items.

TABLE XVII

CORRELATION OF ITEM RANKS, SAME COMMUNITIES, FIRST AND SECOND SURVEYS

Item groups	A	B	C	D	E
Correlation	.75	.50	.17	.71	.68

The relatively high positive correlation for all except the items in Group C (changes desired in the music program) indicated that the results secured by means of the test instrument agreed reasonable with the results of the initial survey in which unstructured opinions were obtained. Since the sample in both cases was drawn from the same communities, validity was claimed for the instrument on the basis of that agreement.

A measure of the reliability of the instrument was secured by comparing the results obtained by means of the test instrument on equated groups of communities. Item ranks on the total returns from communities AI, BI, and CI in the second survey were correlated with item ranks on the total returns from communities AII, BII, and CII in the second survey.

TABLE XVIII

CORRELATION OF ITEM RANKS, EQUATED COMMUNITIES, SECOND SURVEY

Item groups	A	B	C	D	E
Correlation	.96	.50	.40	.99	.50

The relatively high positive correlation for all groups of items indicated that the results secured with the test instrument in communities AI, BI, and CI agreed reasonably with the results secured with the test instrument in communities AII, BII, and CII. Since the sample was drawn from two groups of communities selected by jury opinion to be representative according to the same criteria, reliability was claimed for the test instrument on the basis of that agreement.

Summary and Conclusions

The sample from which unstructured opinions were derived in the first survey was biased in favor of student representation over adult representation, it was partially representative of the occupational categories chosen for stratification of sample, and it was proportional to the sizes of the three communities surveyed. The test instrument constructed from the unstructured opinions disclosed in the first survey was shown to be reasonably valid and reliable on the basis of agreement between the structured opinions

secured with the instrument and unstructured opinions assumed to be valid, and on the basis of agreement between structured opinions secured with the instrument in equated communities.

The sample from which structured opinions were derived in the second survey was biased in favor of student representation over adult representation, the adult portion of the sample was not proportional to community size but the student portion of the sample was proportional between communities, and the total sample was reasonably representative of occupational categories chosen for stratification of sample.

It was concluded that the data derived from the student sample in six communities could be pooled for further study without limitation. The data derived from the adult sample was pooled on the assumption that it satisfied all criteria established for validity in this study with the exception of representation according to size of community.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data used for purposes of analysis and comparison consisted of the following:

1. Unstructured opinions disclosed by the first survey, common to the three communities surveyed, as reported in TABLE IV, Chapter II.

2. Rank order of unstructured opinions determined by frequency of mention in the three communities surveyed as reported in TABLE VI, Chapter III.

3. Rank order of structured items derived from unstructured opinions determined by frequency of selection in the second survey of six communities as reported in TABLE VII, Chapter III.

4. Strengths of common opinions within the six communities indicated by responses to each structured item in terms of agreement, disagreement, or lack of opinion as reported in TABLE VIII, Chapter III.

Unstructured Opinions

The first phase of the study disclosed some common opinions about the music education program in three selected communities. Since the three communities were chosen to be representative of all the communities in the area studied, and since the sample was shown to be reasonably representative of the population of that area, it can be assumed that the opinions expressed were representative of the area of study.

On that basis, general observations can be made about

the common unstructured opinions expressed.

1. Public school music should attempt to provide maximum opportunities for participation. This was indicated in three opinions: as one of the things most liked about the school music program, as one of the things disliked, and as a change to be made. It could be implied in the opinions relative to the need for better equipment and facilities.

2. The population surveyed was appreciative of the band concerts, band shows at athletic events, and other programs presented, and desirous that more public concerts and programs be presented.

3. The initial survey indicated that the public was aware of the type, variety, and quality of music used. One opinion expressed approval of the fact that a variety of music was used, including both popular and classical. Another opinion was critical of the choice of music. A third opinion stated a desire that more well-known music be used, specifying popular, folk, and/or "hill-billy."

4. An opinion closely related to those mentioned above was the desire that the school place more stress on teaching appreciation of music. This might have been interpreted as being somewhat contradictory of the request that more well-known music be used. Or, it might have represented an awareness on the part of a segment of the population of the importance of teaching children to be consumers as well as performing participants.

5. In general, the public expressed some degree of approval of the music teachers, felt that the music program was being conducted efficiently, commented specifically on the contribution made by the high school band to community affairs, and appreciated the fact that children learn to sing and play instruments.

6. The importance of the ability of the teacher to maintain discipline was evident since opinions relative to that ability were advanced in three different categories of the initial survey.

7. Among the things liked about the teacher were general personality, teaching ability, general qualifications as a musician, sincerity and genuine interest, understanding of individual differences, patience, and a cooperative attitude. This was as might have been

expected. The omissions might be considered to be more significant. No specific reference was made to the ability of the teacher as a performer, not even as an opinion mentioned only once. In general, the emphasis was on personality traits and general characteristics rather than specialized musical skills.

8. The principal criticisms of the music teacher, in addition to lack of ability as a disciplinarian, were also concerned with personality traits. A few of the respondents in each community felt that the teacher was too critical and outspoken, too strict, tactless, or prone to lose patience and temper too easily.

The unstructured opinions discussed briefly above were important chiefly because they were freely expressed, and because they were common reactions of three distinct segments of the population to three different music education programs. Thus, they represent partially the attitudes of the public toward music in the schools. Further analysis of the data derived from studies based on these unstructured opinions was necessary before any conclusions could be drawn.

Rank Order of Unstructured Opinions Determined by Frequency of Mention

In the preceding section, the unstructured opinions were considered solely as discrete items without reference to their comparative weights. Some estimate of the relative importance of each opinion was indicated by ranking them according to frequency of mention in the total sample. This rank order was used in reporting the unstructured opinions in TABLE IV, Chapter II.

The rank order of each opinion was determined for each of the three communities participating in the initial survey. This was reported in TABLE VI, Chapter III. The opinions were identified by the group number assigned to the survey item derived from each unstructured opinion. These rank orders were compared by communities.

Group A consisted of things liked about the way music was taught in the schools. The items ranked first, second, or third in each community were as follows:

Community AI - Items A5, A9, A1
Community BI - Items A11, A9, A1
Community CI - Items A9, A8, A5

One item (A9) was ranked among the top three in all three communities: There is an opportunity for every child to take part in some music activity who wants to.

Item A1 ranked high in communities AI and BI: We have a fine music teacher. The teacher in community CI was not re-hired at the end of the school year during which this survey was made.

Item A5 was considered important in communities AI and CI: The music department presents interesting and entertaining programs. The quality of programs presented by the music department of the high school of community AI, the smallest community, was considerably inferior to that of community CI. This comparison would indicate in some measure that community approval of a music program is not predicated entirely on the aesthetic excellence of the out-put. Nor, as

was evident in community CI, does approval of the programs presented indicate similar approval of the teacher responsible for those programs.

In community BI item A11 ranked first: We have a very good high school band. Of the three schools participating in the initial survey this was the only one employing separate instrumental and vocal teachers. The band director had developed a strong instrumental program and was well-liked in the community.

The items receiving the lowest ranks in each community were:

Community AI - Items A2, A3, A4, A6, A7, A10 (equal ranks)
Community BI - Items A3, A10, A2, A7
Community CI - Items A3, A4, A6, A10 (equal ranks)

Two items ranked among the lowest in all three communities: item A3 - Children learn to sing and/or play instruments; and, item A10 - The teacher is a good disciplinarian.

Of the items in Group B, things disliked about the way music is taught in the schools, item B3 ranked first in communities BI and CI, and second in community AI: Our school does not have enough equipment or good facilities for the music program. This opinion gains some added measure of significance when considered in conjunction with the second of the three common opinions in this category, item B1: There is not enough opportunity for all the children to take part in music activities who want to.

In direct opposition to this was the opinion which ranked first in all three communities in Group A to the effect that there was an opportunity for every child to participate who wanted to (item A9). This opinion was advanced by more than three times as many respondents as those who supported the contradictory item BI. It should be noted also that the frequency for item BI varied inversely with the size of the community. This would indicate that the smaller community does not provide opportunities for participation proportional to those provided by the larger communities. This would be a reasonable assumption, but from it there would follow logically the assumption that an expression of need for increased facilities and equipment should also vary inversely with the size of the community. This was not true in the case of item B3 in which an opinion with reference to inadequacy of facilities and equipment was proposed by more cases in the largest community. Until later quantitative analysis of data secured in the second survey provides a basis for generalization, it can be said that the preceding qualitative comparison might indicate that a segment of the population had expressed a desire for an augmented program with corresponding increase in facilities independent of its opinion about the adequacy of the program at present.

The third opinion in Group B was also contradictory of one of the high ranking opinions in Group A, item B2: The music lacks variety, or is of poor quality. Opinion was

equally divided on this item both in the totals and in community comparisons.

In comparing by communities the rank order of items in Group C, changes desired in the music education program, further emphasis was added to opinions already noted. An expressed need for more opportunities for participation (item C3) ranked first in community AI, second in community BI, and third in community CI.

The corollary of this, that the school should provide better equipment and facilities (item C4), ranked fourth in community AI, first in community BI, and second in community CI. The only generalization possible on the basis of the data up to this point was that these two items apparently were of primary concern to the respondents comprising the initial sample.

Group D consisted of things liked about the music teacher. The items ranked among the top three in each community were as follows:

Community AI - Items D7, D4, D8
Community BI - Items D1, D2, D5
Community CI - Items D8, D4, D5

None of the items was common to all three communities. Three items were common to two communities:

Item D4 - Our music teacher has a fine personality.
Item D8 - Our teacher is well-qualified.
Item D5 - Our teacher is sincere, has a genuine interest in music and in individual pupils.

The lowest ranking items in each community were:

Community AI - D1, D2, D3, D5, D6
Community BI - D8, D3, D7
Community CI - D3, D1, D2, D6

Common to all three communities was item D3: Our teacher has a cooperative attitude, and is able to secure the cooperation of the pupils.

Three items were common to two communities:

Item D1 - Our music teacher knows how to teach well.
Item D2 - Understands individual differences.
Item D6 - Our teacher is very patient.

Of the three opinions in Group E, which was concerned with things disliked about the music teacher, the item which ranked first in all three communities was item E2: Our music teacher is too critical and outspoken, lacking tact, too strict.

On the basis of a descriptive analysis of the rank order of unstructured opinions, as determined by frequency of mention in the initial survey of three communities, the following generalizations seemed warranted:

1. The desire for increased opportunities for participation in musical activities ranked high in all three communities, and was of prime importance on the basis of total response.

2. The segment of the public sampled indicated more interest in an extensive program of music education (desire for more public performances), than in an intensive program with emphasis on techniques, skills, and appreciations.

3. The fact that the teacher is a good disciplinarian was appreciated, but was not considered to be of paramount importance. In general, this was true also of the public attitude toward efficient conduct of the music program.

4. The public was more concerned with the performance aspects of the high school program than with the quality and type of music education at the grade level.

5. An evident desire for more variety in the music used was indicated.

6. The fact that children learn to sing or to play instruments was either taken for granted, or was not considered to be very important.

7. The personality of the teacher was the most important item in determining public reaction to him as an individual and to his work.

8. Less emphasis was placed on such qualifications as ability to teach and general musicianship. No mention was made of specific skills.

Rank Order of Structured Items Derived from Unstructured Opinions Determined by Frequency of Selection in the Second Survey

From the unstructured opinions considered in the preceding section thirty test items were derived, each item designed to elicit the original opinion. Each respondent was asked to select the one item in each group which he considered most important of those presented in the group. On the basis of frequency of selection it was possible to rank items within groups in a manner comparable to that used in ranking the original opinions in the first survey by frequency of mention. The ranks so obtained were reported in TABLE VII, Chapter III.

From the ranks assigned on the basis of total scores for the six communities surveyed, it was possible to arrange the items in order of frequency of mention.

Group A: What do you like about the way music is taught in your schools?

A9 - There is an opportunity for every child to take part in some music activity who wants to.
A8 - A variety of music is used, both popular and classical.
A11 - We have a very good high school band.
A5 - The music department presents interesting and entertaining programs.
A1 - We have a fine music teacher (or teachers).
A6 - The high school band takes part in community affairs.
A3 - Children learn to sing and/or play instruments.
A4 - In general, music is taught and conducted efficiently.
A2 - We have good instruction for beginners on instruments in the elementary grades.
A10 - The teacher is a good disciplinarian.
A7 - General music is taught well in the elementary grades.

When this order is compared with the item order from the first survey it should be noted that item A9 (opportunity for participation) ranked first on both surveys, and that the frequency in both cases was far in excess of the frequency of response to any other single item. Items A8 (variety of music used) and A11 (good band) ranked high on both surveys. Item A5 (good programs) shared third rating with A8 on the first survey, and was fourth on the second survey. Thus, there was good agreement on the top items in both surveys.

Item A10 (good disciplinarian) was relatively unimportant in both surveys. Items A2 and A7, both referring to the grade school program, were low on both surveys.

Group B: What do you dislike about the way music is taught in your schools?

B3 - Our school does not have enough equipment or good facilities for the music program.
B1 - There is not enough opportunity for all the children to take part in music activities who want to.
B2 - The music lacks variety, or is of poor quality.

When compared with the results of the first survey, the item order for Group B showed that in spite of extreme variation in local conditions the need for more equipment and facilities was considered most important in both surveys.

Group C: What changes would you like to see in the way music is taught in your schools?

C2 - More well-known music should be used - popular, folk, and/or hill-billy.
C5 - Teachers should put more emphasis on teaching children to appreciate good music.
C4 - The school should provide better facilities and equipment for the teaching of music.
C3 - More opportunities should be provided for more children to take part in some music activity.
C1 - The music groups should present more public programs.

Here there is no significant agreement between the order of items in the two surveys. This was evident also in the correlations reported in TABLES XVII and XVIII, Chapter IV. It must be concluded that the five items in Group C represent common opinions as to changes necessary in the way music is taught, but that priority of item is dependent more upon local conditions than was evident in any of the other four groups.

Group D: What do you like about your music teacher and/or the way he/she teaches?

D8 - Our teacher is well-qualified, knows a lot about music, and is a good musician.
D4 - Our music teacher has a fine personality in

general.

D1 - Our music teacher knows how to teach well, does good work, and gets results.
D5 - Our teacher is sincere, has a genuine interest in music and in individual pupils.
D6 - Our teacher is very patient.
D3 - Our teacher has a cooperative attitude, and is able to secure the cooperation of the pupils.
D2 - Our teacher understands individual differences and is able to get the most out of individual pupils.
D7 - Our teacher is a good disciplinarian.

Items D4 (personality), D1 (ability to teach), and D8 (well-qualified) ranked high on both surveys. Items D2 (understands individual differences) and D3 (cooperative attitude) were low on both surveys. Item D7 (disciplinary ability) which ranked fifth on the first survey was lowest in the group on the second survey.

Group E: What do you dislike about your music teacher and the way he/she teaches?

E3 - Our teacher loses patience and temper too easily.
E1 - Our teacher is a poor disciplinarian.
E2 - Our music teacher is too critical and outspoken, lacking tact, too strict.

Items E1 and E2 were selected by the same number of respondents on the second survey. Item E3 was selected by almost as many respondents as E1 and E2 combined. Item E1 was lower on both surveys which would indicate, in a sense, that either of the other items was considered to be more important.

Because of the relatively high correlation between the responses of the same communities on first and second surveys as reported in TABLE XVII, and equated communities on the second survey as reported in TABLE XVIII, it was deemed unnecessary to undertake any further analysis of item ranks

by separate communities. The principal result of the analysis of total responses undertaken in this section was a strengthening and confirmation of the generalizations advanced on the basis of the responses in the first survey.

Strengths of Common Opinions

From the second survey of all six communities data was obtained relative to the strengths of each opinion. This data was reported in TABLE VIII, Chapter III. The responses to each item were reported by frequency and percent of total. This section is devoted to an analysis of each item in terms of the most frequent response as indicated by the totals for the six communities. Because the sample was not proportionately representative of the adult-student population, gross differences between adult and student response are noted.

Item A1: We have a fine music teacher (or teachers).

The percent of the total sample who responded YES was 72. The percent who responded YES in each community was as follows: AI - 83.3, BI - 63.5, CI - 53.1, AII - 6.0, BII - 93.1, CII - 90.6.

In community AI 97% of the students responded YES as compared with 67% of the adults. A criticism advanced by adults in this community was to the effect that the teacher "did not try to be friendly with townspeople." It is significent to note that the student response to almost all of the items of the instrument was more favorable than the adult response, indicating that a certain amount of "halo" effect

was operative based upon the evident popularity of the teacher with the students.

In community BI the situation was reversed. The teacher was a gregarious individual who made a deliberate point of emphasizing public relations in his instrumental music program.

The teacher in community CI was well-qualified, respected, but unpopular. He was not re-hired at the end of the school year in which this survey was made.

The teacher in community AII was inexperienced and unpopular. He was not re-hired.

The teacher in community BII was extremely popular with both students and adults. Also, the teacher in CII was well-liked by the community.

As in the case of community AI it was noted that the differences between adults and student opinion established in the responses to item A1 set a pattern which was adhered to rather generally in the responses to items which followed.

Item A2: We have good instruction for beginners on instruments in the elementary grades.

The percent of the total sample who responded YES was 50.7.
The breakdown by communities was: A1 - 57.4, BI - 48.1, CI - 36.1, AII - 20.0, BII - 61.6, CII - 62.5.

The differences between adult and student opinion were noticeable on this item in all six communities. Also, a high percentage of responses was in the NO OPINION category. It is possible that this indicated a lack of knowledge on

the part of the public as to both extent and quality of the grade music program, rather than a withholding of approval.

Item A3: Children learn to sing and/or play instruments.

YES - 77.3%; AI - 90.7, BI - 71.2, CI - 71.4,
AII - 62.0, BII - 80.5, CII - 83.8.

There was general agreement on this item which ranked fifth in importance on the basis of selection. Thus, the public expressed approval of the fact that children were acquiring musical competencies, but did not consider it to be the most important aspect of the music program.

Item A4: In general, music is taught and conducted efficiently.

YES - 71.7%; AI - 77.8, BI - 71.2, CI - 57.8,
AII - 22.0, BII - 84.3, CII - 85.6.

The pattern of responses established for item AI was evident here with the same factors operative.

Item A5: The music department presents interesting and entertaining programs.

YES - 76.3%; AI - 79.6, BI - 69.2, CI - 65.3,
AII - 28.0, BII - 91.8, CII - 89.4.

This verified a general comment made earlier to the effect that public approval of programs was not proportional to the size of the community or the scope of musical activities within the school.

Item A6: The high school band takes part in community affairs.

YES - 71.8%; AI - 61.1, BI - 79.8, CI - 56.5,
AII - 10.0, BII - 86.2, CII - 89.4.

The responses to this item follow a general pattern

evident in the responses to items A1, A4, and A5.

Item A7: General music is taught well in the elementary grades.

YES - 45.0%; AI - 51.9, BI - 43.3, CI - 38.8,
AII - 22.0, BII - 46.5, CII - 55.0.

The pattern of responses to this item compares generally to that of the responses to item A2. Both opinions were concerned with aspects of the grade music program. It should be noted that the grade music was taught by a teacher other than the instrumental teacher in communities BI, BII, CI, and CII. The difference in response to items A2 and A7 was greatest in community BII where the grade supervisor was unpopular while the instrumental teacher was extremely popular.

Item A8: A variety of music is used, both popular and classical.

YES - 68.7%; AI - 72.2, BI - 51.9, CI - 58.5,
AII - 36.0, BII - 82.4, CII - 84.4.

This item ranked second in frequency of selection in this group. It could be assumed that a proportionately high percentage of respondents would agree with this item. Such was not the case. On seven other items in Group A the percent responding YES was greater. A possible explanation for this apparent discrepancy could be that in choosing item A8 as one of the most important aspects of the music program the respondents were expressing a desired ideal rather than advancing an opinion as to the relative degree of existence of the item in an actual program.

This hypothesis can be tested partially by comparing

the responses to similar items in different categories. Items B2 and C2 are related in intent to item A8.

Item B2: The music lacks variety, or is of poor quality.

NO - 68.1%; AI - 55.6, BI - 54.8, CI - 61.2,
AII - 32.0, BII - 85.5, CII - 81.3.

Item B2 is partially a negative statement of item A8. Thus, the general agreement between the NO responses to item B2 and the YES responses to item A8 tends to substantiate the opinion that approximately 68% of the total sample felt that a variety of music was used in the music education program.

Item C2: More well-known music should be used - popular, folk, and/or hill-billy.

YES - 60.5%; AI - 50.0, BI - 61.5, CI - 70.1,
AII - 68.0, BII - 64.2, CII - 48.8.

Considered in conjunction with the responses to items A8 and B2, the responses to item C2 indicate that although 68% of the respondents agreed that a variety of music was used, 60% felt that more "popular" music should be used. In other words, a considerable segment of the sample felt that while a variety of music was used, more variety was desirable particularly in an increase in the amount of popular music used, and that this aspect of the music program was one of the most important considerations.

It should be noted that as regards the responses to item C2 students disagreed with adults in all six communities. The students desired more popular music, the adults tended to skirt the issue as evidenced by the comparatively high per-

centage of NO OPINION responses.

Item A9: There is an opportunity for every child to take part in some music activity who wants to.

YES - 77.4%; AI - 83.3, BI - 73.3, CI - 73.5,
AII - 74.0, BII - 79.9, CII - 80.6.

This item ranked first in frequency of selection and also in terms of percentage of respondents expressing agreement with the opinion. That percentage was noticeably high in all six communities. As in the case of the response to item A5 (interesting programs) the opinion expressed was not proportional to the size of the community or the scope of the music program.

The difference between adult and student opinion was greatest in community AII. While only 41% of the adults agreed with the item, 91% of the students felt that opportunity for participation was available. This was the only item in Group A which elicited an enthusiastic response from either adults or students in this community.

The responses to item A9 should be compared with the responses to items B1 and C3 which were similar in intent or related.

Item B1: There is not enough opportunity for all children to take part in music activities who want to.

NO - 50.4%; AI - 42.6, BI - 38.5, CI - 52.4,
AII - 40.0, BII - 54.7, CII - 58.1.

This opinion was the direct antithesis of the opinion in item A9. Ideally, the negative response to item B1 should

have equalled the positive response to item A9. Both responses should be compared with the response to item C3.

Item C3: More opportunities should be provided for more children to take part in some music activity.

YES - 53.3%; AI - 53.7, BI - 43.3, CI - 57.8,
AII - 66.0, BII - 52.8, CII - 51.9.

From the total response to this item it was indicated that 53.3% of the sample felt that more opportunities should be provided. But, the response to item B1 showed that 21.4% felt that there was not enough opportunity. And, from the response to item A9, it can be seen that only 9.6% felt that there was not an opportunity for all to take part.

Apparently, the discriminatory power of these items was low. Yet, it can not be ignored that an opinion about opportunities for participation appeared in three categories as an unstructured opinion, that items based on the opinion ranked first in importance in terms of frequency of mention, frequency of selection, and highest percentage of response in the first category. No specific percentage can be assigned to a generalization as to the strength of the opinion itself because of the wide variation in response to similar items.

Item A10: The teacher is a good disciplinarian.

YES - 56.1%; AI - 74.1, BI - 43.3, CI - 34.7,
AII - 14.0, BII - 76.1, CII - 71.3.

This item was repeated literally in item D7, and antithetically in item E1.

Item D7: Our teacher is a good disciplinarian.

YES - 55.8%; AI - 72.2, BI - 48.1, CI - 36.1,
AII - 14.0, BII - 76.1, CII - 66.3.

Item E1: Our teacher is a poor disciplinarian.

NO - 56.5%; AI - 66.7, BI - 44.2, CI - 44.9,
AII - 20.0, BII - 73.6, CII - 66.3.

The responses to items A10, D7, and E1 indicated that approximately 56% of the respondents felt that their teacher was a good disciplinarian. The pattern of responses by communities was familiar.

Item A11: We have a very good high school band.

YES - 76.7%: AI - 68.5, BI - 80.8, CI - 68.7,
AII - 8.0, BII - 84.3, CII - 98.1.

The response in community CI varied from the pattern, indicating, possibly, that the respondents respected the quality of work done by the teacher in spite of their evident lack of respect for him as a personality.

Items B1 and B2 were considered as repeated items.

Item B3: Our school does not have enough equipment or good facilities for the music program.

NO - 42.3%; AI - 25.9, BI - 18.3, CI - 32.0,
AII - 30.0, BII - 56.6, CII - 62.5.

Opinion on this item was more evenly divided than on any other item. While 42.3% of the total disagreed with item B3, 30.7% agreed, and 27% voiced no opinion. Considered by communities, the smaller communities expressed the opinion that the school did not have enough equipment and facilities to a greater degree than did the larger communities. Adults and students did not differ significantly in any community.

Item C4 could be considered as related to item B3.

Item C4: The school should provide better facilities and equipment for the teaching of music.

YES - 50.3%; AI - 66.7, BI - 61.5, CI - 61.2,
AII - 70.0, BII - 36.5, CII - 35.0.

The total response to item B3 indicated that 30.7% of the respondents felt that the school did not have adequate facilities and equipment. From this it might be assumed that not more than that figure would also feel that the school should provide better facilities and equipment. Instead, 50.3% agreed with the statement to that effect in response to item C4.

A similar lack of agreement was noted in the responses to the items which dealt with the extent of opportunity for participation. Since opportunities for participation are partially dependent on equipment and facilities there could be a basis for similarity of response to the two items. Thus, it was evident in both cases that a higher percentage of respondents favored an increase in opportunities for participation with an increased provision of facilities and equipment than had originally favored an expression of need for both.

Item C1: The music groups should present more public programs.

YES - 58.0%; AI - 55.6, BI - 51.0, CI - 71.4,
AII - 76.0, BII - 54.7, CII - 45.8.

The response by communities indicated a higher degree of general agreement with this item than was evident for most of

the other items. There was no pattern of response to indicate that the size of community or scope of program had any significant influence on the response. Student agreement exceeded adult agreement in communities CI, AII, BII, and CII.

Items C2, C3, and C4 were considered as repeated items.

Item C5: Teachers should put more emphasis on teaching children to appreciate good music.

YES - 58.9%; AI - 57.4, BI - 51.0, CI - 57.8,
AII - 80.0, BII - 63.5, CII - 54.4.

The responses to this item did not follow the pattern by communities evident in most of the cases. The general agreement among students and adults was fairly consistent. The adult agreement exceeded student only in communities BI and AII reflecting student feeling toward the teacher in those communities.

An interpretation of the response to this item is complicated by several factors which must remain matters of conjecture, but which suggest possibilities for further study. The respondents might have assumed that the statement of opinion referred to emphasis on appreciation rather than on active participation. This would lead to a generalization quite different from the one which would follow if it were assumed that the respondents were expressing a reaction to an opinion calling for more emphasis on appreciation of "good" music. Another complication was created by the fact that 61% of the respondents indicated approval of a statement

of need for more popular music in the school program. In this case, student response exceeded adult response in all six communities.

Item D1: Our music teacher knows how to teach well, does good work, and gets results.

YES - 68.8%; AI - 77.8, BI - 59.6, CI - 49.7,
AII - 8.0, BII - 86.8, CII - 90.6.

The response to this item agreed generally with the response to item A1 (we have a fine music teacher).

Item D2: Our teacher understands individual differences and is able to get the most out of individual pupils.

YES - 48.1%; AI - 59.3, BI - 38.5, CI - 27.9,
AII - 6.0, BII - 64.2, CII - 66.3.

The total affirmative response to this item was the lowest of all total affirmative responses to items in the category of things liked about the music teacher. The item ranked low in frequency of mention and selection. A familiar pattern of response was evident. Adult-student difference of opinion was most noticeable in community A1 where 83.3% of the students agreed with the item as compared to 29.2% of the adults.

Item D3: Our teacher has a cooperative attitude, and is able to secure the cooperation of the pupils.

YES - 55.9%; AI - 66.7, BI - 46.2, CI - 25.2,
AII - 24.0, BII - 70.4, CII - 82.5.

In community AI 80% of the students agreed with this item while 50% of the adults responded in the affirmative. In communities BI, BII, and CI the adult affirmative response

was greater than that of the students.

Item D4: Our music teacher has a fine personality in general.

YES - 73.3%; AI - 81.5, BI - 58.7, CI - 56.5,
AII - 52.0, BII - 86.2, CII - 90.0

This item received the highest percentage of affirmative responses of any item in this category, and it ranked first in both frequency of mention and selection. It was one of the two items in this category which did not elicit the characteristic pattern of response evident throughout the survey. The difference between adult and student opinion was most noticeable in the two smallest communities, AI and AII, in both of which the student affirmation exceeded adult.

Item D5: Our teacher is sincere, has a genuine interest in music and in individual pupils.

YES - 66.5%; AI - 70.4, BI - 61.5, CI - 52.4,
AII - 38.0, BII - 76.1, CII - 80.6.

In community AI, 83% of the students responded in the affirmative to this item, but only 54% of the adults agreed. In the other communities there was more general agreement between adults and students. On all items dealing with personal characteristics of the teacher, the response in community AI exhibited this difference.

Item D6: Our teacher is very patient.

YES - 50.1%; AI - 59.3, BI - 33.7, CI - 32.0,
AII - 64.0, BII - 49.7, CII - 70.6.

The response to item D6 can be compared with the response to item E3 which is a negative statement of the opinion

implicit in item D6.

Item E3: Our teacher loses patience and temper too easily.

NO - 52.7%; AI - 50.0, BI - 38.5, CI - 40.8,
AII - 64.0, BII - 50.9, CII - 71.9.

The general agreement between the responses to items D6 and E3 was evident. The characteristic pattern of response often noted was not as marked. There was less difference between adult and student opinion in the two largest communities, CI and CII.

Item D7 was discussed previously as a repeated item related to items A10 and E1.

Item D8: Our teacher is well-qualified, knows a lot about music, and is a good musician.

YES - 70.3%; AI - 75.9, BI - 67.3, CI - 54.4,
AII - 14.0, BII - 82.4, CII - 90.6.

This item received the second highest percentage of affirmative response given items in this category. It also ranked second in frequency of mention and selection. The difference between adult and student response was most noticeable in communities AI and BI. Again, the students in community AI responded more in favor of the teacher than did the adults, while the situation was reversed in community BI.

Item E2: Our music teacher is too critical and outspoken, lacking tact, too strict.

NO - 61.1%; AI - 53.7, BI - 42.3, CI - 45.6,
AII - 74.0, BII - 73.6, CII - 73.8.

A significant departure from pattern of response was evident in that 74% of the respondents in community AII

responded in the negative to item E2. The opinion apparently did not represent traits disliked in spite of the rather general disapproval of the teacher and his work in this community. The greatest difference between adult and student opinion was again in community AI.

In this section the strength of each opinion was noted in terms of the most frequent response and the percentage of respondents who indicated that response. Responses were compared by communities, and gross differences between adult and student opinion were noted. This completes a descriptive analysis of the data which consisted of common unstructured opinions, common unstructured opinions ranked by frequency of mention in the original survey, structured items derived from common unstructured opinions ranked by frequency of selection in the second survey, and strengths of common opinions as disclosed by the total response to structured items in the six selected communities.

Comparisons of Sub-Groups for Significant Differences of Opinion

The analyses of data thus far were concerned with gross responses in terms of frequency and percent. Because the sample was shown to be non-representative of the adult population, differences between adult response and student response were noted and compared. The next step consisted of dividing the sample into contrasting sub-groups in order to compare the responses of those sub-groups for significant

differences of response.

The pooled data of the second survey was categorized by sub-groups according to information supplied by the respondent on the questionnaire portion of the test blank. The contrasting sub-groups considered were:

Ia. Adults comprising professional-managerial categories (000, 200, 300, 400)
b. Adults comprising farm-labor categories (100, 700, 730, 900)

IIa. Total adults
b. Total students

IIIa. Two largest communities (CI and CII)
b. Two smallest communities (Al and AII)

IVa. Male adults
b. Female adults

Va. Adults over forty years of age
b. Adults under forty years of age

VIa. Adults who have had children in school
b. Adults who have not had children in school

VIIa. Parents whose children have been in music groups
b. Parents whose children have not been in music groups

VIIIa. Adults with musical experience
b. Adults without musical experience

IXa. Adults who like the way music is taught and/or the teacher
b. Adults who dislike the way music is taught and/or the teacher, or have no opinion

Xa. Adults who attend programs often
b. Adults who attend programs occasionally or never

XIa. Male students
b. Female students

XIIa. Students in grades eleven and twelve
b. Students in grades nine and ten

XIIIa. Students who are in music groups
b. Students who are not in music groups

XIVa. Students who like the way music is taught and/or the teacher
b. Students who dislike the way music is taught and/or the teacher, or have no opinion

XVa. Students who attend programs often
b. Students who attend programs occasionally or never

The paired sub-groups were compared for significant difference of response to each item of the opinion test. Levels at which differences were significant were determined by means of the test for differences between percentages used throughout the study. The most frequent response to each item was selected to be tested.

The findings were reported by item, response tested, frequency of response for each category (t_1 and t_2), percentage of response for each category (t_1/n_1 and t_2/n_2), and level of significance of difference when that difference proved to be significant at either the .05 or the .01 level.

TABLE XIX

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGERIAL CATEGORIES WITH FARM AND LABOR CATEGORIES FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Adults comprising professional and managerial categories
$n_1 = 86$
t_2 - Adults comprising farm and labor categories
$n_2 = 61$

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	69	41	.802	.672	-
A2	Yes	60	32	.698	.525	.05
A3	Yes	74	51	.860	.836	-
A4	Yes	72	39	.837	.639	.01
A5	Yes	77	46	.895	.754	.05
A6	Yes	77	38	.895	.623	.01
A7	Yes	52	33	.605	.541	-
A8	Yes	65	42	.756	.689	-
A9	Yes	62	42	.721	.689	-
A10	Yes	56	33	.651	.541	-
A11	Yes	72	39	.837	.639	.01
B1	No	33	22	.384	.361	-
B2	No	59	35	.686	.574	-
B3	No	39	17	.453	.279	.05
C1	Yes	35	32	.407	.525	-
C2	Yes	24	19	.279	.311	-
C3	Yes	39	31	.453	.508	-
C4	Yes	37	34	.430	.557	-
C5	Yes	45	38	.523	.623	-
D1	Yes	64	37	.744	.607	-
D2	Yes	50	25	.581	.410	.05
D3	Yes	60	34	.698	.557	-
D4	Yes	64	42	.744	.689	-
D5	Yes	66	37	.767	.607	.05
D6	Yes	51	31	.593	.508	—
D7	Yes	49	33	.570	.541	-
D8	Yes	65	43	.756	.705	-
E1	No	40	25	.465	.410	-
E2	No	48	30	.558	.492	-
E3	No	51	27	.593	.443	-

TABLE XX

COMPARISON OF ADULTS WITH STUDENTS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Adults
n_1 = 192
t_2 - Students
n_2 = 482

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	147	338	.766	.701	-
A2	Yes	121	221	.630	.459	.01
A3	Yes	168	360	.875	.747	.01
A4	Yes	147	336	.766	.697	-
A5	Yes	162	352	.844	.730	.01
A6	Yes	150	334	.781	.693	.05
A7	Yes	118	185	.615	.384	.01
A8	Yes	136	327	.708	.678	-
A9	Yes	138	384	.719	.797	.05
A10	Yes	114	264	.594	.548	-
A11	Yes	150	367	.781	.761	-
B1	No	76	264	.396	.548	.01
B2	No	127	332	.661	.689	-
B3	No	69	216	.359	.448	.05
C1	Yes	88	303	.458	.629	.01
C2	Yes	59	349	.307	.724	.01
C3	Yes	95	264	.495	.548	-
C4	Yes	93	246	.484	.510	-
C5	Yes	30	294	.156	.610	.01
D1	Yes	136	328	.708	.680	-
D2	Yes	101	223	.526	.463	-
D3	Yes	127	250	.661	.519	.01
D4	Yes	143	352	.745	.730	-
D5	Yes	135	313	.703	.649	-
D6	Yes	111	227	.578	.471	.05
D7	Yes	107	269	.557	.558	-
D8	Yes	143	331	.745	.687	-
E1	No	87	294	.453	.610	.01
E2	No	104	308	.542	.639	.05
E3	No	101	254	.526	.527	-

TABLE XXI

COMPARISON OF LARGEST COMMUNITIES WITH SMALLEST COMMUNITIES FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Two largest communities
n_1 = 306
t_2 - Two smallest communities
n_2 = 104

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	226	48	.739	.462	.01
A2	Yes	151	41	.493	.394	-
A3	Yes	233	80	.761	.769	-
A4	Yes	219	53	.716	.510	.01
A5	Yes	242	57	.791	.548	.01
A6	Yes	220	38	.719	.365	.05
A7	Yes	131	39	.428	.375	-
A8	Yes	217	57	.709	.548	.01
A9	Yes	235	82	.768	.788	-
A10	Yes	172	47	.562	.452	-
A11	Yes	235	41	.768	.394	.01
B1	No	164	43	.536	.413	.05
B2	No	226	46	.739	.442	.01
B3	No	137	29	.448	.279	.01
C1	Yes	192	68	.627	.654	-
C2	Yes	205	61	.670	.587	-
C3	Yes	169	62	.552	.596	-
C4	Yes	148	71	.484	.683	.01
C5	Yes	186	71	.608	.683	-
D1	Yes	211	46	.690	.442	.01
D2	Yes	143	35	.467	.337	.05
D3	Yes	149	48	.487	.462	-
D4	Yes	220	70	.719	.673	-
D5	Yes	198	57	.647	.548	-
D6	Yes	126	64	.412	.615	.01
D7	Yes	174	46	.569	.442	.05
D8	Yes	211	48	.690	.462	.01
E1	No	183	46	.598	.442	.01
E2	No	184	66	.601	.578	-
E3	No	141	59	.461	.443	-

TABLE XXII

COMPARISON OF MALE ADULTS WITH FEMALE ADULTS
FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Male adults
n_1 = 69
t_2 - Female adults
n_2 = 121

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	54	101	.783	.835	-
A2	Yes	45	76	.652	.628	-
A3	Yes	59	100	.855	.826	-
A4	Yes	54	91	.783	.752	-
A5	Yes	60	98	.870	.810	-
A6	Yes	59	91	.855	.752	-
A7	Yes	38	78	.551	.645	-
A8	Yes	50	86	.725	.711	-
A9	Yes	52	83	.754	.686	-
A10	Yes	39	73	.565	.603	-
A11	Yes	58	92	.841	.760	-
B1	No	30	52	.435	.430	-
B2	No	48	77	.696	.636	-
B3	No	31	32	.449	.264	.01
C1	Yes	34	53	.493	.438	-
C2	Yes	20	35	.290	.289	-
C3	Yes	59	56	.855	.463	.01
C4	Yes	36	53	.522	.438	-
C5	Yes	36	68	.522	.562	-
D1	Yes	51	90	.739	.744	-
D2	Yes	41	58	.594	.479	-
D3	Yes	48	76	.696	.628	-
D4	Yes	54	87	.783	.719	-
D5	Yes	50	82	.725	.678	-
D6	Yes	39	70	.565	.579	-
D7	Yes	40	65	.580	.537	-
D8	Yes	52	86	.754	.711	-
E1	No	38	51	.551	.421	-
E2	No	38	69	.551	.570	-
E3	No	40	48	.580	.397	.05

TABLE XXIII

COMPARISON OF ADULTS OVER FORTY WITH ADULTS UNDER FORTY FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Adults over forty years of age
$n_1 = 124$
t_2 - Adults under forty years of age
$n_2 = 69$

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	100	48	.806	.696	-
A2	Yes	84	36	.677	.522	.05
A3	Yes	106	55	.855	.797	-
A4	Yes	97	47	.782	.681	-
A5	Yes	105	54	.847	.783	-
A6	Yes	97	51	.782	.739	-
A7	Yes	80	35	.645	.507	-
A8	Yes	94	43	.758	.623	.05
A9	Yes	87	49	.702	.710	-
A10	Yes	82	30	.661	.435	.01
A11	Yes	101	48	.815	.696	-
B1	No	45	27	.363	.391	-
B2	No	87	40	.702	.580	-
B3	No	41	23	.178	.333	.05
C1	Yes	56	33	.452	.478	-
C2	Yes	32	24	.133	.348	.01
C3	Yes	62	34	.500	.493	-
C4	Yes	59	36	.476	.522	-
C5	Yes	66	37	.532	.536	-
D1	Yes	95	39	.766	.565	.01
D2	Yes	75	25	.605	.362	.01
D3	Yes	86	38	.694	.551	.05
D4	Yes	99	44	.798	.638	.05
D5	Yes	92	42	.742	.609	-
D6	Yes	79	31	.637	.449	.05
D7	Yes	77	29	.621	.420	.01
D8	Yes	96	44	.774	.638	.05
E1	No	62	26	.500	.377	-
E2	No	68	37	.548	.411	-
E3	No	68	32	.548	.464	-

TABLE XXIV

COMPARISON OF ADULTS WHO HAVE HAD CHILDREN IN SCHOOL WITH ADULTS WHO HAVE NOT HAD CHILDREN IN SCHOOL FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Adults who have had children in school
n_1 = 155
t_2 - Adults who have not had children in school
n_2 = 37

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	121	26	.781	.703	-
A2	Yes	104	17	.671	.459	.05
A3	Yes	132	28	.852	.757	-
A4	Yes	116	29	.748	.784	-
A5	Yes	127	32	.819	.865	-
A6	Yes	119	29	.768	.784	-
A7	Yes	98	18	.632	.486	-
A8	Yes	112	26	.723	.703	-
A9	Yes	110	27	.710	.730	-
A10	Yes	94	18	.606	.486	-
A11	Yes	126	26	.813	.703	-
B1	No	60	14	.387	.378	-
B2	No	99	27	.639	.730	-
B3	No	51	13	.329	.351	-
C1	Yes	77	12	.497	.324	-
C2	Yes	46	11	.397	.297	-
C3	Yes	77	19	.497	.514	-
C4	Yes	73	21	.471	.568	-
C5	Yes	81	25	.523	.676	-
D1	Yes	112	22	.723	.595	-
D2	Yes	84	15	.542	.405	-
D3	Yes	103	22	.665	.595	-
D4	Yes	118	25	.761	.676	-
D5	Yes	114	21	.735	.568	.05
D6	Yes	91	18	.587	.486	-
D7	Yes	89	16	.574	.432	-
D8	Yes	117	23	.755	.622	-
E1	No	78	12	.503	.324	-
E2	No	92	16	.594	.432	-
E3	No	88	16	.568	.432	-

TABLE XXV

COMPARISON OF PARENTS WHOSE CHILDREN HAVE BEEN IN MUSIC GROUPS WITH PARENTS WHOSE CHILDREN HAVE NOT BEEN IN MUSIC GROUPS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Parents whose children have been in music groups
$n_1 = 120$
t_2 - Parents whose children have not been in music groups
$n_2 = 35$

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	96	26	.800	.743	-
A2	Yes	84	20	.700	.571	-
A3	Yes	105	27	.875	.771	-
A4	Yes	95	21	.792	.600	.05
A5	Yes	103	25	.858	.714	.05
A6	Yes	95	25	.792	.714	-
A7	Yes	76	22	.633	.629	-
A8	Yes	92	20	.767	.571	.05
A9	Yes	92	16	.767	.457	.01
A10	Yes	82	15	.683	.429	.01
A11	Yes	96	27	.800	.771	-
B1	No	47	10	.392	.286	-
B2	No	82	19	.683	.543	-
B3	No	45	7	.375	.200	-
C1	Yes	64	14	.533	.400	-
C2	Yes	35	10	.292	.286	-
C3	Yes	59	19	.492	.543	-
C4	Yes	59	15	.492	.429	-
C5	Yes	67	14	.558	.400	-
D1	Yes	88	24	.733	.686	-
D2	Yes	68	17	.567	.486	-
D3	Yes	82	21	.683	.600	-
D4	Yes	91	27	.758	.771	-
D5	Yes	91	23	.758	.657	-
D6	Yes	72	19	.600	.543	-
D7	Yes	76	14	.633	.400	-
D8	Yes	92	25	.767	.714	-
E1	No	66	13	.550	.371	-
E2	No	73	20	.608	.571	-
E3	No	70	19	.583	.543	-

TABLE XXVI

COMPARISON OF ADULTS WHO HAD MUSICAL EXPERIENCE WITH ADULTS WHO HAD NO MUSICAL EXPERIENCE FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Adults with musical experience
n_1 = 111
t_2 - Adults without musical experience
n_2 = 81

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	84	63	.757	.778	-
A2	Yes	73	48	.658	.593	-
A3	Yes	95	66	.856	.815	-
A4	Yes	87	60	.784	.741	-
A5	Yes	94	68	.847	.840	-
A6	Yes	90	60	.811	.741	-
A7	Yes	64	54	.577	.667	-
A8	Yes	83	53	.748	.654	-
A9	Yes	80	58	.721	.716	-
A10	Yes	61	53	.550	.654	-
A11	Yes	85	65	.766	.802	-
B1	No	45	31	.405	.383	-
B2	No	81	46	.730	.568	.05
B3	No	35	34	.315	.420	-
C1	Yes	46	42	.414	.519	-
C2	Yes	32	27	.288	.333	-
C3	Yes	53	42	.477	.519	-
C4	Yes	61	32	.550	.395	.05
C5	Yes	68	35	.613	.432	.05
D1	Yes	79	57	.139	.704	.01
D2	Yes	61	40	.550	.494	-
D3	Yes	76	51	.685	.630	-
D4	Yes	80	63	.721	.778	-
D5	Yes	90	45	.811	.556	.01
D6	Yes	60	51	.541	.630	-
D7	Yes	61	46	.550	.568	-
D8	Yes	83	60	.748	.741	-
E1	No	49	38	.441	.469	-
E2	No	65	39	.586	.481	-
E3	No	58	43	.523	.531	-

TABLE XXVII

COMPARISON OF ADULTS WHO LIKE THE WAY MUSIC IS TAUGHT WITH ADULTS WHO DISLIKE THE WAY MUSIC IS TAUGHT FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Adults who like the way music is taught and/or the teacher
$n_1 = 157$
t_2 - Adults who dislike the way music is taught and/or the teacher, or have no opinion
$n_2 = 35$

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	140	7	.892	.200	.01
A2	Yes	114	7	.726	.200	.01
A3	Yes	143	18	.911	.514	.01
A4	Yes	137	10	.873	.286	.01
A5	Yes	144	18	.917	.514	.01
A6	Yes	136	14	.866	.400	.01
A7	Yes	109	9	.694	.257	.01
A8	Yes	123	13	.783	.371	.01
A9	Yes	122	16	.777	.457	.01
A10	Yes	109	5	.694	.143	.01
A11	Yes	137	13	.873	.371	.01
B1	No	64	12	.408	.341	-
B2	No	121	6	.771	.171	.01
B3	No	57	12	.363	.343	-
C1	Yes	66	22	.420	.629	.05
C2	Yes	44	15	.280	.429	-
C3	Yes	71	24	.452	.686	.05
C4	Yes	74	19	.471	.543	-
C5	Yes	79	24	.503	.686	.05
D1	Yes	130	6	.828	.171	.01
D2	Yes	98	3	.624	.178	.01
D3	Yes	120	7	.764	.200	.01
D4	Yes	131	12	.834	.343	.01
D5	Yes	128	7	.815	.200	.01
D6	Yes	103	8	.656	.229	.01
D7	Yes	102	5	.650	.143	.01
D8	Yes	134	9	.854	.257	.01
E1	No	81	6	.516	.171	.01
E2	No	92	12	.586	.343	.01
E3	No	79	12	.503	.343	-

TABLE XXVIII

COMPARISON OF ADULTS WHO ATTEND PROGRAMS OFTEN WITH ADULTS WHO ATTEND OCCASIONALLY OR NEVER FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Adults who attend programs often
$n_1 = 99$
t_2 - Adults who attend programs occasionally or never
$n_2 = 93$

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	81	66	.818	.710	-
A2	Yes	74	47	.747	.505	.01
A3	Yes	89	72	.899	.774	.05
A4	Yes	84	63	.848	.677	.01
A5	Yes	85	77	.859	.828	-
A6	Yes	85	65	.859	.699	.01
A7	Yes	65	53	.657	.570	-
A8	Yes	84	52	.848	.559	.01
A9	Yes	75	63	.758	.677	-
A10	Yes	67	47	.677	.505	.05
A11	Yes	83	67	.838	.720	.05
B1	No	30	46	.303	.495	.01
B2	No	76	51	.768	.548	.01
B3	No	41	28	.414	.301	-
C1	Yes	44	44	.444	.473	-
C2	Yes	23	36	.232	.387	.05
C3	Yes	42	53	.424	.570	.05
C4	Yes	47	46	.475	.495	-
C5	Yes	55	48	.556	.516	-
D1	Yes	79	57	.798	.613	.01
D2	Yes	59	42	.596	.452	.05
D3	Yes	71	56	.717	.602	-
D4	Yes	76	67	.768	.720	-
D5	Yes	81	54	.818	.581	.01
D6	Yes	65	46	.657	.495	.05
D7	Yes	63	44	.636	.473	.05
D8	Yes	82	61	.828	.656	.01
E1	No	52	35	.525	.376	.05
E2	No	64	40	.646	.430	.01
E3	No	62	39	.626	.419	.01

TABLE XXIX

COMPARISON OF MALE STUDENTS WITH FEMALE STUDENTS
FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Male students
n_1 = 229
t_2 - Female students
n_2 = 253

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	149	189	.651	.747	.05
A2	Yes	100	121	.437	.478	-
A3	Yes	163	197	.712	.779	-
A4	Yes	151	185	.816	.731	.05
A5	Yes	147	205	.642	.810	.01
A6	Yes	155	179	.677	.708	-
A7	Yes	79	106	.345	.419	-
A8	Yes	143	184	.624	.727	.05
A9	Yes	174	210	.760	.830	-
A10	Yes	115	149	.502	.589	-
A11	Yes	171	196	.747	.775	-
B1	No	113	151	.493	.597	.05
B2	No	139	193	.607	.763	.01
B3	No	95	121	.415	.478	-
C1	Yes	144	159	.629	.628	-
C2	Yes	172	177	.751	.700	-
C3	Yes	128	136	.559	.538	-
C4	Yes	117	129	.511	.510	-
C5	Yes	122	172	.533	.680	.01
D1	Yes	127	181	.555	.715	.01
D2	Yes	103	120	.450	.474	-
D3	Yes	110	140	.480	.553	-
D4	Yes	158	194	.690	.767	-
D5	Yes	149	164	.651	.648	-
D6	Yes	103	124	.450	.490	-
D7	Yes	122	147	.533	.680	.01
D8	Yes	149	182	.651	.648	-
E1	No	138	156	.603	.545	-
E2	No	141	167	.616	.557	-
E3	No	107	147	.467	.423	-

TABLE XXX

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS IN GRADES ELEVEN AND TWELVE
WITH STUDENTS IN GRADES NINE AND TEN
FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Students in grades eleven and twelve
n_1 = 191
t_2 - Students in grades nine and ten
n_2 = 291

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	131	207	.686	.711	-
A2	Yes	74	147	.387	.505	.05
A3	Yes	130	230	.681	.790	.01
A4	Yes	127	209	.665	.718	-
A5	Yes	145	207	.759	.711	-
A6	Yes	139	195	.728	.670	-
A7	Yes	63	122	.330	.419	-
A8	Yes	132	195	.691	.670	-
A9	Yes	143	241	.749	.828	.05
A10	Yes	102	162	.534	.557	-
A11	Yes	140	227	.733	.780	-
B1	No	99	165	.518	.567	-
B2	No	141	191	.738	.656	-
B3	No	90	126	.471	.433	-
C1	Yes	123	180	.644	.619	-
C2	Yes	136	213	.712	.732	-
C3	Yes	106	158	.555	.543	-
C4	Yes	110	136	.576	.467	.05
C5	Yes	123	171	.644	.588	-
D1	Yes	131	197	.686	.677	-
D2	Yes	81	142	.424	.488	-
D3	Yes	99	151	.518	.519	-
D4	Yes	132	220	.691	.756	-
D5	Yes	116	197	.607	.677	-
D6	Yes	71	156	.372	.536	.01
D7	Yes	110	159	.576	.546	-
D8	Yes	124	207	.649	.711	-
E1	No	125	169	.654	.581	-
E2	No	115	193	.602	.663	-
E3	No	89	165	.466	.567	.05

TABLE XXXI

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS IN MUSIC GROUPS WITH STUDENTS NOT IN MUSIC GROUPS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Students who are in music groups
n_1 = 210
t_2 - Students who are not in music groups
n_2 = 272

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	161	177	.767	.651	.01
A2	Yes	110	111	.524	.408	.05
A3	Yes	173	187	.824	.688	.01
A4	Yes	152	184	.724	.676	-
A5	Yes	162	190	.771	.699	-
A6	Yes	146	188	.695	.691	-
A7	Yes	88	97	.419	.357	-
A8	Yes	148	179	.705	.658	-
A9	Yes	180	204	.857	.750	.01
A10	Yes	142	122	.676	.449	.01
A11	Yes	148	219	.705	.805	.05
B1	No	133	131	.633	.482	.01
B2	No	157	175	.748	.643	.05
B3	No	103	103	.490	.379	.05
C1	Yes	133	170	.633	.625	-
C2	Yes	142	207	.676	.761	.05
C3	Yes	112	152	.533	.559	-
C4	Yes	110	136	.524	.500	-
C5	Yes	145	149	.690	.548	.01
D1	Yes	153	175	.729	.643	.05
D2	Yes	117	106	.557	.390	.01
D3	Yes	135	115	.643	.423	.01
D4	Yes	169	183	.805	.673	.01
D5	Yes	151	162	.719	.596	.01
D6	Yes	138	89	.657	.327	.01
D7	Yes	140	129	.667	.474	.01
D8	Yes	158	173	.752	.636	.01
E1	No	149	145	.710	.533	.01
E2	No	168	140	.800	.515	.01
E3	No	141	113	.671	.414	.01

TABLE XXXII

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WHO LIKE THE WAY MUSIC IS TAUGHT WITH STUDENTS WHO DISLIKE THE WAY MUSIC IS TAUGHT FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Students who like the way music is taught and/or the teacher
$n_1 = 358$
t_2 - Students who dislike the way music is taught and/or the teacher, or have no opinion
$n_3 = 124$

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	316	22	.883	.177	.01
A2	Yes	189	32	.528	.258	.01
A3	Yes	290	70	.810	.565	.01
A4	Yes	295	41	.824	.331	.01
A5	Yes	298	54	.832	.435	.01
A6	Yes	277	57	.774	.460	.01
A7	Yes	159	26	.444	.210	.01
A8	Yes	273	54	.763	.435	.01
A9	Yes	302	82	.844	.661	.01
A10	Yes	241	23	.673	.185	.01
A11	Yes	309	58	.863	.468	.01
B1	No	208	56	.581	.452	.05
B2	No	276	56	.771	.452	.01
B3	No	181	35	.506	.282	.01
C1	Yes	223	80	.623	.645	-
C2	Yes	252	97	.704	.782	-
C3	Yes	210	54	.587	.435	.01
C4	Yes	174	72	.486	.581	-
C5	Yes	237	57	.662	.460	.01
D1	Yes	296	32	.827	.258	.01
D2	Yes	211	12	.589	.097	.01
D3	Yes	232	18	.648	.145	.01
D4	Yes	307	45	.858	.363	.01
D5	Yes	271	42	.757	.339	.01
D6	Yes	191	36	.534	.290	.01
D7	Yes	242	27	.676	.218	.01
D8	Yes	294	37	.821	.298	.01
E1	No	257	37	.718	.298	.01
E2	No	260	48	.726	.387	.01
E3	No	214	40	.598	.323	.01

TABLE XXXIII

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS WHO ATTEND PROGRAMS OFTEN WITH STUDENTS WHO ATTEND OCCASIONALLY OR NEVER FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

t_1 - Students who attend programs often
n_1 = 165
t_2 - Students who attend programs occasionally or never
n_2 = 317

Item	Response tested	t_1	t_2	t_1/n_1	t_2/n_2	Level of significance of difference
A1	Yes	128	210	.776	.662	.01
A2	Yes	92	129	.558	.407	.01
A3	Yes	136	154	.824	.486	.01
A4	Yes	127	209	.770	.659	.05
A5	Yes	138	214	.836	.675	-
A6	Yes	126	208	.764	.656	.05
A7	Yes	75	110	.455	.347	.01
A8	Yes	127	200	.770	.631	.01
A9	Yes	143	241	.867	.760	.01
A10	Yes	112	152	.679	.479	.01
A11	Yes	127	240	.770	.757	-
B1	No	104	160	.630	.505	.01
B2	No	136	196	.824	.618	.01
B3	No	91	125	.552	.394	.01
C1	Yes	109	194	.661	.612	-
C2	Yes	105	244	.636	.770	.01
C3	Yes	86	178	.521	.562	-
C4	Yes	84	162	.509	.511	-
C5	Yes	116	178	.703	.562	.01
D1	Yes	130	198	.788	.625	.01
D2	Yes	101	122	.612	.385	.01
D3	Yes	109	141	.661	.445	.01
D4	Yes	136	216	.824	.681	.01
D5	Yes	121	192	.733	.606	.01
D6	Yes	99	128	.600	.404	.01
D7	Yes	108	161	.655	.508	.01
D8	Yes	132	199	.800	.628	.01
E1	No	118	176	.715	.555	.01
E2	No	125	183	.758	.577	.01
E3	No	101	153	.612	.483	.01

Interpretation of Comparisons of Sub-groups

I. Professional-managerial versus farm-labor

The response of adults comprising professional and managerial occupational categories differed significantly (at the .01 level) from that of adults in farm and labor categories on only three of the thirty items of the survey instrument. A significantly higher percentage of professional-managerial adults felt that music was taught efficiently in the schools, that the high school band took part in community affairs, and that there was a good high school band.

This comparison was a partial indication of the lack of so-called "upper-income" bias often associated with the results of questionnaire-type surveys in which the sample is not selected.

II. Adults versus students

Adult response differed significantly from student response on ten items. In general, the students were more critical of the elementary music program, both vocal and instrumental, than the adults were. Proportionately fewer students felt that the music department presented good programs, but there was a greater student desire for more public programs with an increased use of well-known and popular music. Yet, there was also a much greater student demand for more emphasis on teaching an appreciation of good music.

Fifty-five percent of the students denied that there was not sufficient opportunity for participation as compared with forty percent of the adults.

III. Largest communities versus smallest communities

This comparison was based on pooled data combining adult and student response. Thus, the results could not be interpreted as being influenced solely by size of community. It was established that the sample was weighted in favor of student representation, and the preceding comparison showed that student response differed significantly from adult response on ten of the thirty items tested.

The following significant differences of opinion were noted which might be due partially to differences in size of community. In the larger communities the response was significantly higher in support of opinions to the effect that music was taught efficiently, that the music department presented good programs, that a variety of music was used, that the high school had a good band, that the teacher knew how to teach well, and that the teacher was well-qualified.

Agreement was significantly greater in the smaller communities with regard to opinions that the school should provide better facilities, and that the teacher was very patient.

The larger communities exceeded in denying that the music used lacked variety, that there was not enough equipment and facilities for the music program, and that the teacher was a

poor disciplinarian.

IV. Male adults versus female adults

There was a significant difference of opinion on only two items. The male adults exceeded the female adults not only in denying that there was not enough equipment for facilities, but also in supporting the contention that more opportunities for participation should be provided. This apparent inconsistency in response was noted in the analysis of these items in terms of comparative strengths.

V. Adults over forty versus adults under forty

The adults over forty years of age were significantly stronger in support of opinions that the teacher was a good disciplinarian, that the teacher knew how to teach well, and that the teacher understood individual differences. The adults under forty years of age were more in favor of the use of more well-known music, but only thirty-five percent of them agreed with this opinion.

VI. Adults who have had children in school versus adults who have not had children in school

There were no significant differences at the .01 level in the responses of adults comprising these categories.

VII. Parents whose children have been in music groups versus parents whose children have not

Parents who had children in music groups felt more strongly that there was sufficient opportunity for participation, and that the teacher was a good disciplinarian.

VIII. Adults with musical experience versus adults without musical experience

Only fourteen percent of the adults with musical experience felt that the teacher knew how to teach well as compared to seventy percent of the adults without musical experience.

However, with the opinion that the teacher was sincere, a higher percentage of agreement was secured from the adults with musical experience.

IX. Adults who like the teacher versus adults who expressed dislike or no opinion

The opinions of adults comprising these two categories differed significantly on all but eight of the thirty items. Because of that disagreement, the points of similarity of opinion are significant. Thus, it was noted that there was agreement in response to the following items:

B1 - There is not enough opportunity for participation.
B3 - The school does not have enough equipment or facilities.
C1 - The music groups should present more public programs.
C2 - More well-known music should be used.
C3 - More opportunities should be provided.
C4 - The school should provide better facilities.
C5 - Teachers should put more emphasis on teaching children to appreciate good music.
E3 - The teacher loses patience and temper too easily.

The pattern of disagreement was clearly defined. The adults who liked the way music was taught far exceeded the other adults in agreeing with all the items in Group A (things liked about the way music is taught) and Group D (things liked about the music teacher). They also disagreed significantly with the statements that the music lacks

variety, the teacher is a poor disciplinarian, and the teacher is too critical and outspoken, lacking tact, too strict.

X. Adults who attend programs often versus adults who attend occasionally or never

There was a significant difference of response to eleven items of the thirty comprising the test instrument. The pattern of disagreement was not particularly noteworthy in this case. The number of adults who attend programs often (99) compared with the number who indicated that they like the way music is taught (157) indicated that it is possible that approximately two-fifths of those who like the way music is taught do not attend programs often. Thus, the factor of program attendance did not provide distinct categories for comparison.

XI. Male students versus female students

The female student response exceeded the male student response in agreeing that the music department presents good programs, that teachers should put more emphasis on appreciation, that the teacher knows how to teach well, and that the teacher is a good disciplinarian. The female students also were more emphatic in denying that the music used lacks variety.

XII. Grades eleven and twelve versus grades nine and ten

The difference in response was significant on two items only. The lower grades exceeded the upper grades in agreeing that children learn to play or sing, and that the teacher is

very patient.

XIII. Students in music groups versus students not in music groups

There was a significant difference of response to sixteen items. In general, the students in music groups tended to rate the music teacher and specific aspects of his teaching higher than did the students not in music groups.

Significant agreement was noted in response to opinions that, in general, music is taught and conducted efficiently, the music department presents good programs, the band takes part in community affairs, general music is taught well in the elementary grades, a variety of music is used, the music groups should present more programs, more opportunities for participation should be provided, and the school should provide better facilities and equipment for the teaching of music.

XIV. Students who like the teacher versus students who expressed dislike, or no opinion

The opinions of students comprising these two categories differed significantly on all but four of the thirty items. There was agreement in response to opinions that there was not enough opportunity for participation, that the music groups should present more public programs, that more well-known music should be used, and that the school should provide better facilities and equipment.

The pattern of disagreement was similar to that of adults in like categorical comparisons.

XV. Students who attend programs often versus students who attend occasionally, or never

The opinions of students comprising these two categories differed significantly on all but seven of the thirty items. There was agreement in response to opinions that, in general, music was taught efficiently, that the music department presents good programs, that the band takes part in community affairs, that the high school has a good band, that the music groups should present more programs, that more opportunities for participation should be provided, and that the school should provide better facilities and equipment.

The preceding analyses were based on tests of significance of the differences in response of various sub-groups, or categories, in the total sample. The paired sub-groups were compared for difference of response to each item of the structured instrument used for determining the strengths of common opinions. The responses to five of the thirty common opinions showed a high degree of agreement among the sub-groups compared.

C1 - The music groups should present more public programs.

The only significant difference in response to this item was found in the comparison of the opinions of adults and students. Student agreement exceeded adult agreement with this item.

C4 - The school should provide better facilities and equipment for the teaching of music.

The smaller communities affirmed this opinion with a significantly greater response than that of the larger communities.

C3 - More opportunities should be provided for more children to take part in some music activity.

Male adults agreed with this item more than female adults did. Students who liked the way music is taught exceeded the other students in agreeing with the item.

A7 - General music is taught well in the elementary grades.

This opinion was supported by a significantly high percentage of adults who like the way music is taught in the schools, students who like the way music is taught, and students who attend programs often.

C2 - More well-known music should be used - popular, folk, and/or hill-billy.

More students favored this opinion than adults, more adults under forty than adults over forty, and more students who do not attend programs often than students who do.

The item which exhibited the most disagreement in the response of compared sub-groups was item D1 - Our music teacher knows how to teach well, does good work, and gets results. In eight of the fifteen tests of significance there was a significant difference in the responses of sub-groups compared on this item.

From a summation of the significant differences disclosed in each comparison it could be said that the factors which

tended to be most operative in determining differences of opinion were the respondent's feelings for the teacher and his program in terms of like or dislike, the degree to which the respondent attended programs presented by the music groups, student participation in music groups, size of community, and adult/student differences.

The factors which apparently caused little or no difference in opinion were parenthood, having children in music groups, musical experience of adults, grade level in high school, occupational category of the adult respondent, sex, and age of the adult respondent.

Summary

The data analyzed in this chapter consisted of unstructured common opinions about the music education program in three communities, unstructured opinions ranked according to frequency of mention in the first survey, structured items derived from unstructured opinions ranked by frequency of selection in the second survey, and strengths of common opinions as indicated by the most frequent response to each structured item in the second survey.

The unstructured opinions were shown to be representative of the area of the study. On that basis, general observations were made relative to attitudes of the public toward music in the schools as indicated by the common opinions expressed. An analysis of the rank order of unstructured

opinions on the basis of frequency of mention provided a basis for further generalizations as to the comparative importance of the attitudes expressed.

The reasonably high correlation between the rank order of structured items in the second survey and the rank order of unstructured opinions in the first survey provided an acceptable basis for listing the opinions in order of importance according to the total response of the population sampled. The actual strength of each item was then analyzed in terms of the most frequent response to that item. Item strengths were compared among communities and gross differences between adult opinion and student opinion were noted.

The data was then treated in an attempt to discover what factors might be responsible for significant differences of opinion within the total sample. Paired sub-groups were drawn from the sample on the basis of factors isolated for study, and significant differences of opinion were noted. The factors were then classified into two groups according to the degree to which they seemed to be operative in influencing differences of opinion.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

Common Opinions About School Music Expressed by Pupils and Adults

The purpose of the study was to inquire into the nature of attitudes toward school music as expressed in the opinions of pupils and adults, and to determine the strengths and polarities of commonly held opinions within selected communities. The data analyzed in the preceding chapter were based on common opinions about school music derived from a reasonably representative sample of pupils and adults in three communities selected to be representative of the area of the study. The common opinions were tested for strength on a reasonably representative sample of pupils and adults in six communities selected to be representative of the area of the study. Thus, a tabulation of those opinions with the responses to each opinion stated in terms of percentages of the total sample, ranked according to the comparative strengths of the most frequent response, could be assumed to be indicative of the attitudes of residents of selected communities in a specified area of Missouri regarding the music education program as practiced in their schools.

TABLE XXXIV

OPINIONS OF RESIDENTS OF SELECTED COMMUNITIES IN A SPECIFIED AREA OF MISSOURI REGARDING THE MUSIC EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THEIR SCHOOLS

Opinions	Percent of sample		
	Yes	No	No Opinion
What do you like about the way music is taught in your schools?			
1. There is an opportunity for every child to take part in some music activity who wants to.	77.4	9.6	12.9
2. Children learn to sing and/or play instruments.	77.3	3.1	19.6
3. We have a very good high school band.	76.7	9.6	13.6
4. The music department presents interesting and entertaining programs.	76.3	11.0	12.8
5. We have a fine music teacher (or teachers).	72.0	12.6	15.4
6. The high school band takes part in community affairs.	71.8	9.9	18.2
7. In general, music is taught and conducted efficiently.	71.7	11.9	16.5
8. A variety of music is used, both popular and classical.	68.7	15.9	15.4
9. The teacher is a good disciplinarian.	56.1	13.5	30.4
10. We have good instruction for beginners on instruments in the elementary grades.	50.7	9.9	39.3
11. General music is taught well in the elementary grades.	45.0	10.4	44.7
What do you dislike about the way music is taught in your schools?			
1. The music lacks variety, or is of poor quality.	13.6	68.1	18.2

TABLE XXXIV (Continued)

Opinions	Percent of sample		
	Yes	No	No Opinion
2. There is not enough opportunity for all the children to take part in music activities who want to.	21.4	50.4	28.2
3. Our school does not have enough equipment or good facilities for the music program.	30.7	42.3	27.0
What changes would you like to see in the way music is taught in your schools?			
1. More well-known music should be used, popular, folk, and/or hill-billy.	60.5	19.3	20.2
2. Teachers should put more emphasis on teaching children to appreciate good music.	58.9	14.2	26.9
3. The music groups should present more public programs.	58.0	16.2	25.8
4. More opportunities should be provided for more children to take part in some music activity.	53.3	17.8	28.9
5. The school should provide better facilities and equipment for the teaching of music.	50.3	19.6	30.1
What do you like about your music teacher and/or the way he/she teaches?			
1. Our music teacher has a fine personality in general.	73.4	12.5	14.1
2. Our teacher is well-qualified, knows a lot about music, and is a good musician.	70.3	8.6	21.1
3. Our music teacher knows how to teach well, does good work, and gets results.	68.8	12.8	18.4
4. Our teacher is sincere, has a genuine interest in music and in individual pupils.	66.5	12.5	21.1

TABLE XXXIV (Continued)

Opinions	Percent of sample		
	Yes	No	No Opinion
5. Our teacher has a cooperative attitude, and is able to secure the cooperation of the pupils.	55.9	20.0	24.0
6. Our teacher is a good disciplinarian.	55.8	13.6	30.6
7. Our teacher is very patient.	50.1	17.1	32.8
8. Our teacher understands individual differences, and is able to get the most out of individual pupils.	48.1	21.2	30.7
What do you dislike about your music teacher and/or the way he/she teaches?			
1. Our music teacher is too critical and outspoken, lacking tact, too strict.	11.6	61.1	27.3
2. Our teacher is a poor disciplinarian.	15.0	56.5	28.5
3. Our teacher loses patience and temper too easily.	18.4	52.7	28.9

In the analysis of data it was noted that there was a reasonably high correlation between opinions ranked by frequency of mention in the first survey, and the same opinions ranked by frequency of selection in the second survey. Also, there was a similar degree of correlation between opinions ranked by frequency of selection in the second survey, and opinions ranked by strength as in TABLE XXXIV. The principal exception noted was in the case of two opinions in the first group. The second opinion in TABLE XXXIV, that children learn to sing and/or play, ranked seventh in terms of frequency of selection as the most important item in that group. However, the eighth opinion, that a variety of music is used, ranked second in frequency of selection. Thus, except for the specific items noted, the rank order of opinions in TABLE XXXIV is indicative of the relative importance of each opinion according to the total sample of the population.

Community Attitudes Contrasted and Compared

When community attitudes were contrasted and compared it was found that there was a wide range of variation of response between communities. The opinions on which the greatest disagreement between communities was noted, arranged in order of most disagreement to less, were:

1. We have a very good high school band.
2. We have a fine teacher.
3. The teacher knows how to teach well.
4. The high school band takes part in community affairs.

5. The teacher is well-qualified.
6. The music department presents interesting programs.
7. Music is taught efficiently.
8. The teacher is a good disciplinarian.
9. The teacher understands individual differences.
10. The teacher has a cooperative attitude.

The opinions on which there was the least disagreement between communities, arranged in order of least disagreement to more, were:

1. There is an opportunity for all to take part who wish to.
2. More well-known music should be used.
3. More opportunity for participation should be provided.
4. The music department should present more programs.
5. The teacher has a fine personality.
6. Children learn to play and/or sing.
7. Teachers should emphasize appreciation more.
8. The teacher is not too critical, tactless, or strict.
9. General grade music is well-taught.
10. The school should provide better facilities for music.

From this it should be noted that most of the opinions causing the greatest disagreement of response between communities were concerned with the personality and ability of the teacher. A pattern of response was noted in connection with these opinions wherein the relative difference of opinion between communities was fairly constant.

The opinions which exhibited the most agreement between communities were concerned, for the most part, with general aspects of the music program. As should be expected, these included most of the opinions which ranked highest in frequency of mention, frequency of selection, and strength.

It was also noted in this analysis that where adults and students differed markedly, they tended to differ consistently

in their responses to opinions which called for an evaluation of the teacher. Thus, it was concluded that size of community and scope of the school music program had less influence on determining differences of opinion between communities than the personality and qualifications of the teacher.

Factors Causing Differences of Opinion

A more precise measurement of the factors influencing opinion was secured through the comparison of sub-groups in the sample for significant differences of opinion. From the analysis of these comparisons it could be concluded that the factors most operative in determining differences of opinion were: the degree to which the respondent approved of the music teacher and his work in terms of liking the music teacher, attending programs presented by the music department, or participating in school music groups; size of community; differences between adult and student opinion.

The factors which apparently caused little or no difference in opinion were parenthood, having children in music groups, musical background of adult respondents, grade level in school, occupation, sex, and age.

There was very little disagreement on opinions which were concerned with the need for more public programs, the provision of more opportunities for participation with better equipment and facilities, and the use of more well-known

music. The greatest amount of disagreement was evident in connection with the opinion about the ability of the teacher to teach well and get results.

Implications

The opinion which elicited the greatest response was the statement that there is an opportunity for every child to take part in some music activity who wants to. In the original survey, this statement was advanced as an unstructured opinion by the largest number of respondents. In the second survey it ranked first in frequency of selection as the thing liked most about the way music was taught. Also, in the second survey 77.4% of the respondents affirmed that this condition existed in the music program of their respective schools.

Analysis showed that there was very little disagreement between communities or sub-groups on the strength of this opinion Thus, the result could be said to be representative of the opinions of the population of the area studied. The relative importance assigned to opportunities for participation indicates that this item should be considered a significant criterion for evaluating a music education program. The motto of the Music Educators National Conference, "Music for every child; every child for music," is shown to be based on a sound foundation of public approval.

Of the things disliked about the way music was taught,

opinion was advanced that there was not enough opportunity for participation. This was a negation of the first opinion discussed, but it was supported by only 21.4% of the respondents. Analysis showed that the negative response to this opinion did not correspond to the affirmative response to the first opinion. However, it should be noted that since 77.4% of the respondents agreed with the first opinion, and 21.4% agreed with the second, 98.8% of the respondents were accounted for in a statement of opinion as to the extent of opportunity for participation in music activities.

In the same category of opinions, 30.7% of the respondents felt that there was not enough equipment or facilities for the music program. This was slightly in excess of the number who felt that there was not enough opportunity for participation. In the category of changes desired in the music program, 53.3% felt that more opportunities should be provided. And in the same category, 50.3% felt that the school should provide better facilities and equipment.

Thus, it could be summarized that 77.4% of the respondents felt that their schools provided sufficient opportunity for participation, but 53.3% felt that additional opportunities should be provided, and 50.3% felt that the school should provide better facilities and equipment for the music program. These results may be considered as evidence of a desire on the part of a considerable segment of the public for a more extensive music education program.

Three-fourths of the respondents were appreciative of the opportunities for participation provided by the school music program and considered it the most important aspect of the program. In addition, fifty percent of the respondents expressed a desire for increased opportunities with better facilities and equipment to be provided by the school.

The opinion which ranked second in strength, (children learn to play and/or sing), ranked seventh in frequency of selection as the most important item in its category. However, there was little difference of opinion between communities as to the strength of this item. This could imply that the public appreciates the fact that children acquire musical skills, but does not consider this to be the most important aspect of the program. From the results of the survey it was indicated that maximum opportunity for participation, variety of music used, type of programs presented, and the part the band plays in community affairs all ranked higher than acquisition of skills as important aspects of the music education program.

Thus, it would seem to be evident that the public, as represented by the population surveyed, tends to endorse a philosophy of music education in which skills are relegated to a secondary position where they serve as means, not ends, of the educative process. The philosophy is not new, but practice still lags behind in some areas of teaching. The music educator who confines his efforts largely to a program

based on selection aiming at technical proficiency sometimes does so because of a feeling that the public would be reluctant to accept a more functional program of music in the schools. If the results of this study do not wholly disprove this attitude, they do place the problem in an area of reasonable doubt worthy of further study.

The second controversial opinion was the one concerned with the variety of music used in the school music program. A reasonably large segment of the sample (68.7%) agreed that a variety of music was used, including both popular and classical music. The opinion ranked eighth on the basis of strength of response in the category of things liked about the way music is taught, but it ranked second on the basis of frequency of selection as the most important item in its category. Since there was fair agreement between communities and sub-groups, the response to this opinion was assumed to be reasonably representative of the population.

Under the heading of things disliked about the way music is taught, the opinion that the music lacks variety elicited a denial from 68.1% of the sample. This served to confirm the statement of strength of opinion derived in the first instance. Under changes desired in the music program, the opinion was advanced by 60.5% of the sample that more well-known music should be used, including popular, folk, and/or hill-billy. This last result ranked next to the highest in degree of agreement between communities, and exhibited

very little disagreement between sub-groups. It ranked first in its category on the basis of frequency of selection as the most important change desired in the way music is taught.

These results indicate that more than 60% of the population sampled approved of the use of a variety of music in the school music program, including both classical and popular music, and requested that more well-known music be used, specifying popular, folk, and hill-billy. These results are further evidence that a reasonably large segment of the public would be, or is, receptive to a music education program which does not seek its materials solely in fields declared proper by authority.

The problem of the apparent dichotomy between "good" music and "usable" music was discussed earlier. It was stated then that in some quarters it is maintained that music education has been forced to recognize a double standard of values because the public demands that music be used which is good by definition, while at the same time the public seeks its enjoyment in more utilitarian modes of musical expression.

Under changes desired in the music program, the opinion was advanced by 58.9% of the respondents that teachers should put more emphasis on teaching children to appreciate good music. This opinion ranked second in its category according to strength of response and frequency of selection as the most important change desired. There was good agreement

between communities on the strength of response to this item. When considered with the strength of the opinions approving the use of a variety of music and requesting that more well-known music be used, the implications permit two alternative deductions. Either the public sampled was somewhat contradictory, thus providing evidence of the split thinking mentioned above, or the results can be interpreted as evidence of public opinion that there need not be a strict dichotomy. Following a line of reasoning based on the second alternative, it could be said that approximately 60% of the population approved of the use of a variety of music including popular and classical, and also felt that more well-known music should be used, but desired that, in addition, more emphasis be put upon teaching children an appreciation of good music. This is in line with the best educational thought which holds that it is necessary to begin with the child at the level with which he is capable of identifying himself, but does not deny the desirability of looking toward an increase in capacity as a necessary end.

Two opinions dealt with the teaching of music in the elementary grades, both instrumental music and general music. The response to both opinions was rather low, with a high percentage of NO OPINION being expressed. There was moderate agreement between communities and sub-groups on the strength of opinions about the elementary music program. The results would seem to indicate that the public is either

indifferent to the work done in music in the grades, or lacking in knowledge of this phase of the music program.

It can be assumed that public opinion is influenced more by performance of the high school music groups than by the general music classes at either elementary or secondary level. This assumption was partially substantiated by the response to the opinion which stated a request that the high school groups present more public programs. There was little disagreement between communities or sub-groups on the strength of this opinion, and it ranked high in its category on the basis of frequency of selection.

A much larger number of the respondents (76.3%) agreed that the music department presents interesting and entertaining programs, but there was a wide range of variation in strength of response between communities. Thus, it could be concluded that while public opinion varied among communities as to the quality of programs presented, there was sufficient agreement between communities and sub-groups to justify the statement that at least 50% of the population sampled would like more public programs, and further, that it was considered to be one of the more important changes to be made in the way music is taught in the schools.

From these observations it could be concluded that the public is interested in the performance aspect of the music education program, that opinions as to quality of programs presented will vary among communities, but that there was

unanimity of opinion regarding the need for more public programs. It has been said that applause is often the most widely used criterion for evaluating a music education program. It is evident that there is a possibility that the music educator might overemphasize the performance aspect of school music with approval and support of a large segment of the public. The public reaction to opinions regarding general music indicates that this condition might prevail in the communities surveyed.

It should be noted, however, that the public requested more programs, not better programs. This was true even in the communities in which the public was critical of the quality of programs presented. It seems reasonable to assume that the public would approve of a more extensive use of public performance to provide more opportunities for participation in activities designed to further musical growth, and that the public would not be particularly critical of the quality of performance.

This should not be interpreted as an indication that excellence of performance is to be denied in an ideal music education program. On the contrary, the degree of satisfaction to be derived by both participants and auditors will depend largely on the quality of performance. However, the music educator who is reluctant to prosecute vigorously a more extensive program should derive some measure of assurance from the public opinions expressed above.

Opinions about the music teacher varied considerably in strength among communities with one notable exception: 73.4% of the population sampled agreed that their music teacher had a fine personality. There was little disagreement between communities. In the category of things liked about the music teacher, this opinion ranked first in strength of response, and first in frequency of selection as the most important item in that category. Thus, a significant portion of the public placed personality above ability to teach, general qualifications, knowledge, musicianship, and disciplinary ability. It should be noted that among the unstructured opinions elicited in the first survey, there was no mention of specific skills such as ability to perform, conduct, write, or arrange.

It was not the purpose of this study to inquire into the nature of personality, nor to speculate as to the dependence of the general qualities mentioned above upon specific skills skills and abilities. Curricula for the training of music teachers have been based largely on the acquisition of certain skills and knowledge declared to be essential in the opinion of experts in the field of music education. The opinions expressed in this survey would seem to indicate that there may be a divergence of view as to the primacy of certain elements of those curricula. In this connection, significant recommendations for curriculum revision along more functional lines were adopted by the National Association of

Schools of Music in conference at Chicago in December of 1952. It is not necessary to enumerate specific provisions. In general, it was recommended that competencies to be attained be re-defined in terms of functional needs in community teaching situations. The results of this study indicate that the opinion of the public should be considered in determining criteria in terms of community needs.

The implications presented have been based on those opinions which exhibited the most agreement between communities in terms of similarity of response. The results listed in TABLE XXXIV were, therefore, assumed to be valid measures of the strengths of those opinions for the general population sampled. The rest of the opinions varied considerably in strength between communities. In general, these were opinions which dealt with characteristics of the teacher.

Even though the personality and qualifications of the teacher were evidently important factors in determining differences of opinion between communities when compared on the basis of strength of response to each item, analysis showed that size of community was a significant factor in sub-group comparisons. It was evident that there was an obvious relationship between size of community and qualifications of the teacher since the large communities felt more strongly than the small communities that music was taught efficiently, that the music department presented good programs, that a variety of music was used, that the high school had a good

band, that the teacher knew how to teach well, that the teacher was well-qualified, that there were sufficient facilities for the music program, and that the teacher was a good disciplinarian. The smaller communities differed in placing more stress on the need for the school to provide better facilities and equipment.

It would be expected that the teacher in a larger community would be more experienced and better qualified. The significance of the survey results in this respect is simply one of confirmation of that expectation by means of public opinions about the teacher and his work.

There was sufficient difference between the opinions of adults and students to raise a question as to the validity of student opinion alone as a criterion for evaluating a school music program. The students were more critical of the grade music program, the public programs presented, and the type of music used. The students desired more well-known music, but also wanted more emphasis on appreciation of good music. More students felt that there was sufficient opportunity for participation.

There was no significant difference between the opinion of parents of school children and other adults. Since there was considerable difference between all adults and students, it may be assumed that there was considerable difference between students and parents. This provided further substantiation for the belief that student opinion would not

represent an accurate index of public opinion about the school music program.

There was little difference of opinion between parents of children in music groups and other parents of children in school. One expected difference was substantiated by the results of the survey: The parents of children in music groups felt more strongly than other parents that there was sufficient opportunity for participation in music activities.

There was little difference between the opinions of musical and non-musical adults. The adults with a background of musical experience were more critical of the ability of the teacher to teach, but they endorsed him more highly for his sincerity. The adults over forty years of age expressed less approval of the use of popular music than did the younger adults, but this was the only significant difference of opinion between them. Also, there was little difference of opinion between male and female adults.

The greatest difference of adult opinion was found to exist between those adults who said that they liked the teacher and his work, and those who disliked the teacher or expressed no opinion. It would be expected that these adults would differ in opinions regarding the teacher. It was significant that there was no difference in response to those opinions which were related to the extent of opportunities for participation, the need for additional equipment and facilities, the desire for more public programs, the use

of well-known music, and more emphasis on teaching an appreciation of good music.

The comparison of the opinions of students who liked the teacher with opinions of other students produced similar results. Again, there was a large amount of disagreement, but also a significant lack of disagreement on the same opinions as was noted in the case of the adults. The same agreement was noted in comparing the opinions of students in music groups with the opinions of other students.

By eliminating those opinions which exhibited significant disagreement among communities or sub-groups, it was possible to derive a list of opinions which, by implication, could be considered to be most representative of the population of the area of the survey. Because there was little disagreement as to the expressed strengths of these opinions they serve as an index to the status of music as it is taught in the public schools of the area. The selected opinions are listed according to strength rather than in the original categories from which they were derived. The strength of each opinion is indicated by the percentage of respondents supporting that opinion as reported in TABLE XXXIV.

1. There is an opportunity for every child to take part in some music activity who wants to (77.4%)
2. Children learn to sing and/or play instruments (77.3%)
3. Our music teacher has a fine personality in general (73.4%)

4. A variety of music is used, both popular and classical (68.7%)

5. More well-known music should be used - popular, folk, and/or hill-billy (60.5%)

6. Teachers should put more emphasis on teaching children to appreciate good music (58.9%)

7. The music groups should present more public programs (58.0%)

8. More opportunities should be provided for more children to take part in some music activity (53.3%)

9. The school should provide better facilities and equipment for the teaching of music (50.3%)

10. General music is taught well in the elementary grades (45.0%)

Summary

The results of the study consisted of:

1. Opinions of residents of selected communities in a specified area of Missouri regarding the music education program as practiced in their schools.

2. Significant differences of opinion between communities.

3. Factors which could account for differences of opinion.

Community attitudes were contrasted and compared within and between communities on the basis of relative strengths of commonly held opinions. Where significant differences in attitudes were apparent, attempts were made to isolate factors which might account for those differences.

From the results of the study, implications for the aims and practice of music education in specified communities were advanced. These results and implications provided the

basis for general conclusions to follow, with implications for the aims and practice of music education in the community at large.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to inquire into the nature of attitudes toward music education in a specified area of Missouri. Residents of selected communities in the area were asked to express opinions freely and anonymously about the music education program in the schools of their communities. Those opinions were assumed to be a valid expression of the attitudes of the public because:

1. The opinions were unstructured, i.e., freely expressed, not pre-determined.
2. The sample in each community was reasonably representative of the population of that community.
3. The sample in each community was proportional to the size of the population of that community.
4. The opinions were common in that each was expressed by residents in all three of the communities first surveyed.
5. The communities were selected to be most typical of communities of corresponding size in the area.

The common unstructured opinions were tested for strength on a reasonably representative sample of the population of typical communities. In addition, the respondents were asked to select the opinions which represented the most important aspects of the music education program in each group of opinions presented in the survey instrument.

The data of the study consisted of the common

unstructured opinions, the strength of each opinion in the communities surveyed and in the total sample, and the order of importance of opinions when ranked according to frequency of mention in the first survey, frequency of selection in the second survey, and strength in the second survey.

Community attitudes were compared on the basis of strength of opinion. The total sample was divided into sub-groups representative of various categories in the population. Paired sub-groups were compared for significant differences of opinion. Attempts were made to isolate factors responsible for differences of opinion between communities. On the basis of these analyses, implications for the practice of music in the schools of the specified communities were presented.

The opinions on which there was reasonable agreement between communities and sub-groups of the population were proposed to be most representative of the attitudes of the public toward music education in the specified area. The strengths of those opinions in the total sample were taken to be indicative of opinion strength in the general population of the area. Thus, it seemed reasonable to assume that general conclusions based on those opinions would be applicable to music education in the area of the study, and, by implication, to the general practice of music education.

Conclusions

1. Music education should continue to strive to provide maximum opportunities for participation.

The results of the study indicated that music education is providing satisfactory opportunities for participation. Less than ten percent of the population felt that this condition did not exist in their schools. Also, it was indicated that this is the most important aspect of the music program in the opinion of the public. From this it can be said that the primary aim of music education today is being realized in practice, at least in the area surveyed.

Two possible implications seem warranted. The music teacher who emphasizes a selective program without providing satisfactory opportunities for general participation is not building a music program which best meets the needs of the school and the community. Such a program may meet with the approval of a segment of the public because of excellence of select performing ensembles which present fine concerts or win contest ratings. If public opinion is indicative of public reaction, such a program must fail eventually because it does not meet the needs of the larger group.

As a corollary of this, it could be said that the music teacher who is engaged in such a program and is reluctant to change because of actual or anticipated community pressures, has some measure of assurance that he will have the weight of public opinion to support him in attempts to provide a more

extensive program.

2. Despite the rapid growth of school music with a corresponding increase in available activities, the saturation point has not been reached.

The indication of extent of opportunity for participation did not represent complete satisfaction of the public with that most important aspect of the music education program. More than half of the respondents indicated that more opportunities should be provided, and that the school should provide better facilities and equipment which, by implication, would help to make this possible.

The extent of the music program in any community is dependent largely on the funds available. An extensive music program designed to meet community needs is expensive in requirements for personnel, facilities, and equipment Administrators are reluctant to approve changes in the school program which are costly of public funds without assurance of public approval. Fifty percent of the voting public in favor of an increased allotment of funds for the music program does not constitute sufficient endorsement by itself, but the results showed that only twenty percent were opposed, with thirty percent expressing no opinion. It seems reasonable to assume that the public would not resist an augmentation of the typical music program in the area surveyed through an increased expenditure of public funds if more opportunities for participation were provided thereby.

3. In the communities surveyed, quality of performance did

not affect opinions regarding opportunity for participation.

One of the criticisms of an extensive functional music education program has been that quality of performance tends to deteriorate with increased emphasis on amount of participation. It is not the purpose of this study to refute the implication that there is a causal relationship between the two. From the standpoint of attitudes, however, the question can be considered: Would public opinion about a music education program change if quality of performance were to suffer in providing quantity of opportunities for participation?

The results of the study offer some basis for speculation. Attitudes relative to quality apparently were based on public programs presented. The extent of disagreement between communities in this respect indicated a wide variation of opinions as to the quality of public performance in the specified communities. Yet, the public approved of the extensiveness of the music education program with little disagreement between communities, and more than half of the respondents in each community requested that more public programs be presented, also without disagreement.

From these attitudes it could be concluded that, in the communities surveyed, a relatively low opinion of the quality of performance did not affect an appreciation of provision for maximum opportunities for participation. Also, the extent of the request for more programs indicated, in a sense, that the public did not place a premium upon quality

of performance per se.

The public today is able to hear the best in music through the media of radio, television, recordings, and artist series. The public is capable of making comparisons. However, the music educator should not try to meet professional standards of performance with school groups. He should strive constantly for excellence, to be sure, but not at the expense of more desirable goals. The music educator can take advantage of the public interest in performance to provide means for the musical growth of students while at the same time promoting good public relations for the music program.

4. Music education promotes the acquisition of musical skills, but this is not the most important aspect of the program in the opinion of the public.

The public agreed that children are acquiring musical skills as represented by the ability to play instruments or sing. However, the public did not select this as being the most important outcome of the music program. In the area surveyed, the evident emphasis on extensive participation was not an indication that skills had been neglected. It would seem that this offers assurance that the public accepts skills as necessary means, but does not consider them to be the most important outcome of music education.

5. There is a need for more emphasis on teaching an appreciation of good music.

One important end desired by more than half of the public was that more emphasis should be placed on appreciation

of good music. This opinion ranked high as a change most desired in the way music is taught.

By implication, the strength of this opinion constitutes a criticism of the music education program in the communities surveyed. The ability to understand and enjoy music should grow out of every musical activity in which the student is engaged. Apparently there has been a noticeable lack of efforts to foster a growing appreciation.

The opinion might indicate that the public is aware of the fact that relatively few children will become performers, but that all are potential consumers of good music. It might have been expected that parents would support the need for more emphasis on appreciation of good music for their children on this basis. It is significant that, in every community surveyed, students exceeded adults in requesting an increased emphasis on appreciation.

Considered with the evident desire for increased opportunities for participation, there is evidence that a continuation of general music through the high school level would be an approved addition or extension. The general music class is often terminated in the elementary grades or junior high school. Only two of the schools in the communities surveyed offered elective general classes at the high school level. It seems more than coincidence that the request for more emphasis on appreciation was smaller in those two communities, even if not significantly less.

6. There was little evidence that public opinion is dominated by a "good music" fetish.

The expression of need for more emphasis on appreciation did not indicate that the public felt that good music, as such, was lacking in the program. More than sixty percent of the respondents agreed that a variety of music was used, including classical and popular. In addition, that same percentage asked that more well-known music be used, including popular, folk, and "hill-billy." As an evaluation of the musical tastes of the public these opinions provide some interesting contrasts.

As to the opinion of the public in matters of musical taste, two diametrically opposite views have been held by a minority of music educators. According to one view, the public has been pictured as completely opposed to the use of any but the best music for the training of children. It is held that this stems from a deep-rooted fetishism fostered by the professional music teachers of preceding generations. The basic assumption contained in this view is that music which is good by definition is good for the child whether he likes it or not.

The opposite view, held mainly by teachers who are themselves proponents of the same fetishism, has been rather contemptuous of the opinion of the public in matters musical. Because of the alleged low tastes of the public, good music has to be forced upon reluctant students.

The results of this study seem to indicate that neither view is tenable. The public appreciated the fact that a variety of music was used in the schools. While there was evidence that the public, particularly students, would welcome the use of more popular music, there was equal evidence that the public recognized a need for more emphasis on the appreciation of good music.

The resultant attitude is not inconsistent with educational philosophy. Guided by the attitude of the public, the music educator should use a variety of music, but should maintain a proper balance. He will use well-known music, not simply to please the public, but in order to provide materials at a level with which the student is able to integrate himself. He will not be satisfied with a popular program which does not aim at increasing the capacity of the public to enjoy better music.

7. The public tends to evaluate a music teacher in terms of general qualifications and characteristics rather than specific skills and attainments.

The qualifications of the teacher which were viewed with approval by the public as a whole were general in nature. Of these, personality was of primary importance.

The results of the study emphasized the peculiar position of the music educator as a community music agent. The position requires a well-rounded individual capable of establishing and maintaining cordial relations with the public. It would be ridiculous to imply that specialized skills

are not important, but the fact that the public evaluates the teacher on the basis of general qualities, of which personality is apparently the most obvious, can not be ignored. The study indicated that the otherwise capable teacher who was unable to secure the personal approval and liking of students and adults was unable to accomplish a successful program of music education in the community. The factor of personal reaction toward the teacher was the most potent in causing differences of opinion for both adults and students.

The importance of personality as a factor in successful teaching has been recognized for a long time by educators. It was, therefore, to be expected that the results of this study would substantiate that fact. The evidence that the public apparently was not concerned with the ability of the teacher as performer, conductor, composer, arranger, or musicologist has not been accorded general recognition by music educators. It will be argued, perhaps, that the qualities which the public recognizes are intangible products of study and perfection in those skills which the public assumes as expected attributes of its music teachers.

The evidence of the study does not provide sufficient basis for conclusions as to revisions needed in curricula for teacher training. The implications of that evidence, however, do indicate that in evaluating those curricula the needs of the community and the attitudes of the public can not be ignored.

8. There is a need for increased emphasis on general music at both elementary and secondary levels.

The public attitude toward general music in the grades indicated a relatively low opinion of the quality of work done. The large proportion of respondents who offered no opinion, however, might indicate either a lack of knowledge of the grade program or an attitude of indifference.

In any case, it seems reasonable to assume that there is a need for increased emphasis on the general music program. General music should be the core of the whole music program. It should not be considered as separate from secondary music, nor should it be treated as preparation for secondary music activities. As was pointed out earlier, general music should not be terminated at elementary levels, but should provide opportunities for participation to those students who are unable to take part in specialized classes or ensembles.

9. The public proved to be a relatively homogenous group as far as attitudes toward music education were concerned.

There was little difference of opinion between sexes, age groups, or occupational categories. Parents of children in music groups did not differ materially in attitude from other parents, or other adults. Adults with musical experience expressed essentially the same attitudes as other adults. Students differed only in being somewhat more critical of the teacher and his program than adults were.

From this it can be concluded that the music educator

does not have diverse factions in the community population to contend with in shaping a music education program to meet community needs.

Summary Conclusion

The study demonstrated that attitudes of the public toward music education could be determined and measured from a free expression of opinion. There was no guarantee that all the attitudes of the public were disclosed in the process, but it was felt that this was more than outweighed in significance by the validity of the attitudes disclosed.

In any one community surveyed, the attitudes which represented agreement on the part of sub-groups in the population could serve three functions: definition, evaluation, and recommendation. The public attitude could serve to define the status of the music education program, it could serve as a basis for evaluating the program in terms of strengths and weaknesses, and it could provide recommendations for changes desired in the program. The same would be true of attitudes which represent agreement between communities with regard to the general practice of music education.

Thus, it can be said that, in the opinions of the public, music education in practice was defined as being more functional in intent than technical. The public approved, in general, of the conduct of the program. The strengths of the program approved by the public were features of a modern

philosophy of music education, not always realized in practice. The changes recommended were, for the most part, changes which music educators would recommend, but about which there has been uncertainty as to public opinion.

Therein lies the principle value of the results of this study. The results themselves are not startling to music educators. The fact, however, that they represent valid public attitudes is important. A vital program of music education must be concerned with community needs and desires. The results of this study indicated that public opinion, properly treated, can help to point the way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Ahrens, H. J. Edward. "The validity of the questionnaire." Science Education, 34: 41 - 42, February, 1950.

Allport, Gordon W. "Attitudes." Handbook of Social Psychology, C. Murchison, editor. Clark University Press, 1935. p. 698 - 844.

Bain, Read. "Theory and measurement of attitudes and opinions." Psychological Bulletin, 27:357-379.

Bateman, Richard M. "Construction and evaluation of a scale to measure attitude toward any educational program." Journal of Educational Research, 36:502-506, March, 1943.

Bienstock, Sylvia F. and McDavid. "Bibliography in the field of music education." Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1936. p. 284-288.

Bienstock, Sylvia F. "Report of national survey of experimental projects in music education." Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1936. p. 277-283.

Birge, Edward B. History of Public School Music in the United States. Oliver Ditson Company, Philadelphia. 1937.

Blankenship, Albert B. "Does the question form influence public opinion poll results?" Journal of Applied Psychology, 24: 27-30, February, 1940.

Blankenship, Albert B., editor. How to Conduct Consumer and Opinion Research. Harper and Brothers, New York. 1946. p. 289-309.

Blum, William D. "Opinion toward education in Montreal, Canada." Journal of Experimental Education, 15:219-267, June, 1947.

Bryan, Roy C. Pupil Rating of Secondary School Teachers. Teachers College, Columbia University, Teachers College Contributions to Education No. 708, 1937.

Bryant, Laura. "Balanced music program and its results in the community." Music Supervisors National Conference Journal of Proceedings, 1929. p. 240-244.

Burrows, Raymond M. "Music in community education." Music Educators Journal, 25:25-26, September, 1938.

Callahan, Sterling G. "Is teacher rating by students a sound practice?" School and Society, 69:98-100, February 5, 1949.

Cantril, Hadley. Gauging Public Opinion. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1944.

Cohen, Jozef B. "Scale for the measurement of attitude toward the aesthetic value." Journal of Psychology, 12:75-79, July, 1941.

Doll, Ronald C. "High school pupils' attitude toward teaching procedures." School Review, 55:22-227, April, 1947.

Droba, D. D. "Methods for measuring attitudes." Psychological Bulletin, 29:309-323.

Duker, Sam. "Questionnaire is questionable." Phi Delta Kappan, 29:368, May, 1948.

Dykema, Peter W. "Music in the school survey." Music Supervisors Journal, 17:20-21, October, 1930.

Edwards, Allen L. and Franklin P. Kilpatrick. "Technique for the construction of attitude scales." Journal of Applied Psychology, 32:374-384, August, 1948.

Eilert, Grace O. "Music educator and the community." Music Educators Journal, 27:17, October, 1940.

Einstein, Alfred. Music in the Romantic Era. W. W. Norton and Company, New York. 1947.

Fay, Paul F. and Warren C. Middleton. "Relationship between musical talent and preferences for different types of music." Journal of Educational Psychology, 32:573-583, November, 1941.

Foy, Zed L. "School music from the high school principal's viewpoint." Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1935. p. 45-48.

Fromme, Allan. "On the use of certain qualitative methods of attitude research." Journal of Social Psychology, 13:429-459, 1941.

Gallup, George. A Guide to Public Opinion Polls. Princeton University Press, Princeton. 1948.

Garrett, Henry E. and Matthew R. Schenk. Psychological Tests, Methods, and Results. Harper and Brothers, New York. 1933.

Gaston, E. Thayer. "A Study of the Trends of Attitudes Toward Music in School Children With a Study of the Methods Used by High School Students in Sight-reading Music." Kansas Studies in Education, 2:53-56, 1941.

Gehrkens, Karl W. "School music surveys" Music Supervisors Journal, 17:20, March, 1931.

Gerberich, J. B. and J. M. Mason. "Signed versus unsigned questionnaire." Journal of Educational Research, 42:122-126, October, 1948.

Gilliland, Esther G. "School music serves the community." Chicago School Journal, 29:126-130, March, 1948.

Glenn, Mabelle. "Ascertaining attitudes toward music." Music Supervisors Journal, 15:75, March, 1929.

Good, Carter V. "Research methods bibliographies." Phi Delta Kappan, 1946-47, 29:146-152, November, 1947;
1947-48, 30:19-26, September, 1948;
1948-49, 31:38-46, September, 1949.

Good, Carter V., A. S. Barr, and D. E. Scates. The Methodology of Educational Research. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, New York. 1941.

Goodykoontz, Bess. "Parents know what they want for their children." Educational Leadership, 7:286-291, February, 1950.

Hand, Harold C. What People Think About Their Schools. World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson. 1948.

Harris, Dale B. "How children learn interests, motives, and attitudes." Forty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, p. 129-155.

Hartshorne, Hugh and Mark A. May. "First steps toward a scale for measuring attitude." Journal of Educational Psychology, 17:145-162, 1926.

Hetherington, Charles G. "The administrator evaluates his music program." Education, 64:146-147, November, 1943.

Hinckley, E. D. "Influence of individual opinion on construction of an attitude scale." Journal of Social Psychology, 3:283-296, August, 1932.

Hopkins, L. Thomas. "Classroom experimentation in functional music." Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1936, p. 298-301.

James, Carl A. "An Integrated Public Relations Program for Concordia, Kansas." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Kansas, 1950.

Johnson, Palmer O. Statistical Methods in Research. Prentice-Hall, New York. 1949.

Johnson, Roscoe W. "But music education has not failed." Music Educators Journal, 32:24-25, January, 1946.

Katz, Daniel and F. H. Allport. Students Attitudes. Craftsman Press, Syracuse. 1931.

Kibby, Leo P. "Comparative study of the attitudes of students, parents and citizen groups toward problem situations which have risen at Ventura Junior College." American Association of College Registrars Journal, 18:149-158, January, 1945.

Kirkpatrick, Clifford and Sarah Stone. "Attitude measurement and the comparison of generations." Journal of Applied Psychology, 19:564-582, February, 1935.

Koos, Leonard V. The Questionnaire in Education. Macmillan, New York. 1928.

Kramer, A. Walter. "So-called musical public." Music Teachers National Association Proceedings, 1932, p. 94-100.

Kwalwasser, Jacob. "Research in high school music." Sixth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, 1928, p. 383-396.

Larson, William S. Bibliography of Research Studies in Music Education. Music Educators National Conference, Chicago, 1949.

Lee, Edwin A. "Music from the viewpoint of the layman." Music Supervisors National Conference Yearbook, Volume 24:8-13, 1931.

Lee, Edwin A. "What music education may mean for a superintendent of schools." Education, 56:553-558, May, 1936.

Link, Henry C. "The psychological corporations index of public opinion." Journal of Applied Psychology, 30:1-9, 1946.

Likert, Rensis. "A technique for measuring attitudes." Archives of Psychology, 22:number 140.

McEarchern, Edna. A Survey and Evaluation of the Education of School Music Teachers in the United States. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1937.

McEwen, Merrill C. "Educating the community to depend upon the school music department." Music Educators National Conference Yearbook, 1935, p. 124-126.

McKinney, Howard D. and W. R. Anderson. Music in History. American Book Company, New York. 1949.

McNemar, Quinn. "Opinion-attitude methodology." Psychological Bulletin, 43:289-374, July, 1946.

Miller, Clyde R. "Public opinion polls and public schools." Teachers College Record, 43:245-254, January, 1942.

Mitchell, Claude. "Do scales for measuring attitudes have any significance?" Journal of Educational Research, 34:444-452, February, 1941.

Moehlman, Arthur B. Social Interpretation. D. Appleton-Century Company, New York. 1938.

Monroe, Walter S., editor. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Macmillan, New York. 1950.

Morgan, Hazel N. Music Education Source Book. Music Educators National Conference, Chicago. 1947.

Murphy, Gardner and L. B. Murphy. Experimental Social Psychology. Harper and Brothers, New York. 1931.

Norman, Ralph D. "Review of some problems related to the mail questionnaire technique." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 8:235-247, 1948.

Norton, William W. "School music and community culture." Music Supervisors Journal, 17:p. 64, March 1931.

O'Brien, F. P. "Employing student criticism in revising courses in education." Educational Administration and Supervision, 11:394-398, September, 1925.

O'Hara, Patricia. "Attitudes." Chicago School Journal, 29: 115-120, March, 1948.

Peterson, C. H. and Marion L. Faegre. "Note on the measurement of the results of attitude education: an area of needed research." Journal of Educational Psychology, 33:469-470, September, 1942.

Pitts, Lilla Belle. The Music Curriculum in a Changing World. Silver Burdett Company, New York. 1944.

Radtke, Anola. "Positive attitudes toward singing for adolescent boys." Music Educators Journal, 36:48, January, 1950.

Remmers, H. H., editor. "Studies in attitudes" Purdue University Bulletin, Volume 35, number 4, Studies in Higher Education, number 26.

Remmers, H. H. and Naomi Weltman. "Attitude inter-relationships of youth, their parents, and their teachers." Journal of Social Psychology, 26:61-68, August, 1941.

Richey, R. W. and W. H. Fox. "How do college students feel about certain public school policies and procedures?" Educational Administration and Supervision, 35:175-180, March, 1949.

Rogers, William R. "Public Opinion Regarding Selected Purposes of Education in Missouri." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, University of Missouri, 1949.

Romine, Stephen A. "Criteria for a better questionnaire." Journal of Educational Research, 42:69-71, September, 1948.

Rope, Frederick T. Opinion Conflict and School Support. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1941.

Rutledge, Edward P. "Ascertaining attitudes in music." Music Supervisors Journal, 15:73-81, December, 1928.

Sachs, Curt. The Rise of Music in the Ancient World. W. W. Norton and Company, New York. 1943.

Seashore, Robert H. and Kate Hevner. "A time-saving device for the construction of attitude scales." Journal of Social Psychology, 4:366-372.

Sells, Saul B. "Observational methods of research: questionnaires and mass surveys." Review of Educational Research, 18:436-441, December, 1948.

Seyfert, Warren C. "What the public thinks of its schools." School Review, 48:417-427, June, 1940.

Shannon, J. R. "Percentages of returns of questionnaires in reputable educational research." Journal of Educational Research, 42:138-141, October, 1948.

Sherburn, Merrell L. "Is school music serving your community?" Music Educators Journal, 36:13-14, September, 1949.

Swartley, Lloyd F. "Music is a community project." Nations Schools, 27:32, April, 1941.

Symonds, P. M. "What is an attitude?" Psychological Bulletin, 24:200-201, 1927.

Tenenbaum, S. "School attitude questionnaire correlated with such variables as IQ, EQ, past and present grade marks, absence, and grade progress." Educational Administration and Supervision, 27:107-124, February, 1941.

Thurstone, Louis L. "Theory of attitude measurement." Psychological Review, 36:222-241, 1929.

Thurstone, Louis L. and E. J. Chave. The Measurement of Attitude. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1929.

Todd, William H. What Citizens Know About Their Public Schools. Contributions to Education Number 279. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1927.

Ulich, Robert. History of Educational Thought. American Book Company, New York. 1950.

VanPatten, Louise M. "The public thinks aloud." Educational Forum, 9:443-449, May, 1945.

Warner, Robert A. "Attitude test and methods." Journal of Higher Education, 19:315-316, June, 1948.

Watson, Goodwin B. "Character tests and their applications through 1930." Review of Educational Research, 2:183-270, June, 1932.

Wiebe, G. D. "Relation of the music teacher to his community." Educational Method, 18:417-424, May, 1939.

Williams, L. A. "A curriculum study of ideals among junior high school pupils." Journal of Educational Research, 15:263-268, April, 1927.

Wilson, Grace V. "You and your community." Music Educators Journal, 27:31, September, 1940.

Wilson, William R. "Students rating teachers." Journal of Higher Education, 3:75-82, February, 1932.

Woodward, Julian L. "Use of public opinion and market research techniques in education." Educational Record, 30:186-196, April, 1949.

Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Prentice-Hall, New York. 1939.

Zanzig, Augustus D. "The place of the public school in the music of the community." Music Teachers National Association Proceedings, 1930, p. 78-86.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

FORMS, BLANKS, LETTERS, AND COPY FOR PUBLICITY USED IN THE STUDY

Copy for Newspaper Publicity for First Survey

Residents of (name of community) will be given an opportunity to take part in a survey being made in several communities in central Missouri in an attempt to find out what people think about the way music is taught in their schools. The purpose of the survey is to find out what people like and dislike about public school music and what changes they would like to see in the way it is taught.

During the coming week, people whose names have been chosen at random from a list of residents of this community will receive a questionnaire to fill out. Both (name), superintendent of schools, and (name), director of music, have given their approval to this survey and have stated that they hope that everyone who receives a questionnaire will fill it out. It is hoped that the survey will point out ways in which the teaching of music in our schools can be improved.

Copy of Letter Mailed with First Survey

A survey is being made in several communities in central Missouri in an attempt to find out what people think about the way music is taught in their schools. The purpose of the survey is to find out what people like and dislike about public school music and what changes they would like to see in the way it is taught. The survey is being conducted by the undersigned, ... It is hoped that the survey will point out ways in which the teaching of music in our schools can be improved.

We need to know what <u>your</u> opinions and suggestions are. We want to know what <u>you</u> like about the way music is taught in your high school. Also, we want to know what you don't like about the music program and what changes you would like to see made. Even if you feel that you don't know much about the program please give us your frank opinions. We need opinions from adults and children, from men and women, from parents of school children and non-parents, and from every occupation. <u>Your</u> opinions are important.

You can express yourself freely because no one will know what <u>you</u> have said. Your name has been chosen at random from a list of residents of this community. You are asked not to sign your name to the enclosed information blank. No one will see your return but the undersigned director of the survey. Both your superintendent and music director have given their approval to this survey.

This return can be filled out by any adult member of your household, or by any high school pupil living in your home. We hope that you will take time to reply using the stamped and addressed envelope enclosed. The success of this survey depends on getting freely expressed opinions from a large number of people in your community. We can only earnestly ask for your help, and thank you in advance for your kindness.

(Signature)

(Position)

Copy of questionnaire used in first survey

Information Blank

Will you please supply the information requested below in either Section A or Section B? If you are an adult fill out Section A. If you are a high school pupil fill out Section B. Remember, please do not sign your name. We want you to be able to express your opinions freely knowing that no one will identify what you have said with you. After filling out either Section A or Section B please fill our Section C.

SECTION A
(to be filled out by adults)

What is your occupation? _____

If you are a housewife, what is your husband's occupation? _____

(Please draw a circle around the correct answer to the following questions)

1. What is your sex? Male Female

2. About how old are you? Under 20 40 to 50
20 to 30 50 to 60
30 to 40 Over 60

3. Do you have children in school now? Yes No

4. Have you had children who have attended school in this community? Yes No

5. If the answer to 3 or 4 is "Yes," have any of your children been in the school band, orchestra, chorus, or glee clubs? Yes No

6. Have you ever played or sung in a music group? Yes No

7. In general, do you like the way music is taught in your schools? Yes No No opinion

8. In general, do you like your high school music director? Yes No No opinion

9. How often do you attend programs put on by the high school music groups? Often Occasionally Never

(Please turn to SECTION C)

SECTION B
(to be filled out by high school pupils)

(Please draw a circle around the correct answer to the following questions)

1. What is your sex? Male Female

2. In what grade are you in school? 9 10 11 12

3. Are you in high school band, orchestra, chorus, or glee club now? Yes No

4. Did you learn to play an instrument in grade school? Yes No

5. In general, do you like the way music is taught in your schools? Yes No No opinion

6. In general, do you like your high school music director? Yes No No opinion

7. How often do you attend programs put on by the high school music groups? Often Occasionally Never

(Please go on to SECTION C)

SECTION C

This section is to be used by either adults or high school pupils. Will you please express your opinions freely knowing that no one will know what you have said? You may type, print, or write with pen or pencil in the spaces provided. If you need more space please feel free to continue on another sheet of paper. (Note: On the printed forms, sufficient space was allowed after each question for expression of opinions)

1. What are the things you like most about the music program in your schools?

2. What are the things you dislike about the music program in your schools?

3. What changes would you like to see made in the way music is taught in your schools?

4. What are the things you like most about your high school teacher and the way he (or she) teaches?

5. What are the things you dislike most about your high school music teacher and the way he (or she) teaches?

After finishing this section, please fold this sheet and mail it using the enclosed envelope. No postage is needed.

Copy for Cards Mailed to Stimulate Returns, First Survey

Recently you and many of your friends and neighbors were asked to assist in a survey being conducted in your community to determine your opinions about the music program in your schools. We sincerely appreciate the many replies which have come in so far. But in order to complete a satisfactory summary for your community we need many more. If you have not returned the questionnaire yet will you please fill it out and mail it soon?

Sincerely,

(signature)

Copy for Newspaper Story, Second Survey, Used in Communities Which Had Participated in First Survey

A second, and final, questionnaire is to be mailed soon to people in (name of community) to complete a survey being made in several communities in central Missouri. The purpose of the survey is to find out what people like and dislike about public school music and what changes they would like to see in the way it is taught. The survey is being conducted by

Shortly after the first of the year, people whose names had been chosen at random from a list of residents of this community received a questionnaire to fill out. This initial study was made in three different communities of which (name of community) was one. From the returns on the first part of the survey, a second and different type of questionnaire was constructed which will be mailed to a random sample of the residents of several communities including (name of community). The second questionnaire is designed to measure the strength of common opinions disclosed in the first part of the survey.

Both (name), superintendent of schools, and (name) director of music, gave their approval to this survey since it is hoped that it will point out ways in which the teaching of music in our schools can be improved. They hope that everyone who receives a questionnaire will fill it out. Those people who received the first questionnaire will not receive the second one.

Copy of Letter Mailed with Second Survey Instrument

A survey is being made in several communities in central Missouri in an attempt to find out what people think about the way music is taught in their schools. The purpose of the survey is to find out what people like and dislike about public school music and what changes they would like to see in the way it is taught. The survey is being conducted by the undersigned, ...

You can express yourself freely because no one will know what you have said. Your name has been chosen from a list of residents of this community. You are asked not to sign your name to the enclosed information blank. No one will see your return but the undersigned director of the survey. Both your superintendent and music director have given their approval to this survey (see copy of letter below).

This return can be filled out by any adult member of your household. Separate returns will be provided at school for high school pupils to fill out. We hope that you will take time to reply using the stamped and addressed envelope enclosed. The success of this survey depends on getting freely expressed opinions from a large number of people in your community. We can only earnestly ask for your help, and thank you in advance for your kindness.

(signature)

(position)

(COPY)

(Name) is working on a music survey in our community and has the approval of the superintendent of schools and the music director to continue this survey. We feel that the work he is doing is very worthwhile for the future planning of the music education program in the public schools of Missouri.

We will appreciate it very much if you will give him your support.

Very truly yours,

(signature)
Superintendent of Schools

(signature)
Director of Music

Copy of Questionnaire Used in Second Survey

Will you please supply the information requested below? Please do not sign your name. We want you to be able to express your opinions freely knowing that no one will identify what you have said with you.

(Note: The information requested was the same as in the first survey. Separate forms were provided for adults and students.)

Here are five groups of statements which probably apply to the way music is taught in your schools. Will you please express your opinion on each statement by placing a check X in one of the spaces after each statement. Check YES if you think the statement is true; check NO if you think the statement is not true; check NO OPINION if you do not have an opinion as to whether the statement is true or not, or it does not apply in your school.

Group A	YES	NO	NO OPINION
1. We have a fine music teacher (or teachers).			
2. We have good instruction for beginners on instruments in the elementary grades.			
3. Children learn to sing and/or play instruments.			
4. In general, music is taught and conducted efficiently.			
5. The music department presents interesting and entertaining programs.			
6. The high school band takes part in community affairs.			
7. General music is taught well in the elementary grades.			
8. A variety of music is used, both popular and classical.			
9. There is an opportunity for every child to take part in some music activity who wants to.			
10. The teacher is a good disciplinarian.			
11. We have a very good high school band.			

Which of the above statements represents the thing that you like best about the way music is taught in your schools? Place the number of that statement in this box.

Group B	YES	NO	NO OPINION
1. There is not enough opportunity for all the children to take part in music activities who want to.			
2. The music used lacks variety, or is of poor quality.			
3. Our school does not have enough equipment or good facilities for the music program.			

Which of the above statements represents the thing that you dislike most about the way music is taught in your schools? Place the number of that statement in this box.

Group C			
1. The music groups should present more public programs.			
2. More well-known music should be used - popular, folk, and/or hill-billy.			
3. More opportunities should be provided for more children to take part in some music activity.			
4. The school should provide better facilities and equipment for the teaching of music.			
5. Teachers should put more emphasis on teaching children to appreciate good music.			

Which of the above statements represents a change that you would most like to see made in the way music is taught in your schools? Place the number of that statement in this box.

Group D			
1. Our music teacher knows how to teach well, does good work, and gets results.			
2. Our teacher understands individual differences, and is able to get the most out of individual pupils.			
3. Our teacher has a cooperative attitude, and is able to secure the cooperation of the pupils.			
4. Our music teacher has a fine personality in general.			
5. Our teacher is sincere, has a genuine interest in music and in individual pupils.			
6. Our teacher is very patient.			

	YES	NO	NO OPINION
7. Our teacher is a good disciplinarian.			
8. Our teacher is well-qualified, knows a lot about music, and is a good musician.			

Which of the above statements represents the thing that you like most about your music teacher and the way he (or she) teaches? Place the number of that statement in this box.

Group E

1. Our teacher is a poor disciplinarian.			
2. Our music teacher is too critical and outspoken, lacking tact, too strict.			
3. Our teacher loses patience and temper too easily.			

Which of the above statements represents the thing that you dislike most about your music teacher and the way he (or she) teaches? Place the number of that statement in this box.

Please fold this sheet and mail it using the enclosed envelope. No postage is needed.